

like an esprit de corps, in spite of the fact that the Institute has as yet no home of its own. The play given last Saturday night was called "You'll Get There" based on Dr. Benderly's promise three years ago to the city college students whom he had invited, that if they would pursue the three years' course they would be provided with positions. Changes have taken place in the meantime, and the demand for men teachers is not very great. Consequently the men feel disappointed that Benderly fails to carry out his promise. I was very much amused by the play, particularly by the part where they caricatured my manner of teaching Bible Interpretation, which they designated "Biblical Interruption."

On Sunday night I attended by invitation the social meeting of the lately organized Teachers Association, which consists for the most part of students and graduates of the Teachers Institute. The social took place at the Y.W.H.A. I made a few remarks.

On Monday the opening of the Extension course for social workers took place at the Heinsheimer Building of the Y.M.H.A. Warburg made the opening remarks in which he tried to conciliate the Chatauqa people who are holding a similar course in New York. The first lecture was on dependent normal children in orphan asylums. It was given by Dr. Bernstein.

* * * *

Tuesday, July 13, 1915

During the last two weeks in June I was busily at work on the two lectures which I was expected to give as part of the Extension Course of the School of Communal work. The ~~xxxx~~ lectures were designated as "The Aim of Jewish Education" and "Jewish Teaching as a Profession." They were given on Thursday and Friday afternoons, July 1st and 2nd. The attendance was made up largely of the people connected with the Bureau of Education, who, I believe, constitute the greater part of the attendance of all of the lectures. This means simply, that the

entire course has no intrinsic interest, and that its proportions and importance are kept artificially inflated through Dr. Benderly's exertions. To this day I cannot see why it was at all necessary to expend so much energy upon work that is little needed or demanded. How disgusting this playing for the favor of the Kuhn Loeb & Co. interests. No wonder that a man like Magnes has lost caste with the Zionist leaders of this country, and that he lost out for the time being to a man like Brandeis. I learned from Friedlaender that Magnes came back from the Zionist Convention which took place in Boston, a defeated man. He was practically snubbed by the leaders in the movement on account of his connections with Schiff, Warburg, Marshall and Co. The fact is that Magnes has not the stability of mind or purpose to know exactly whose favor he should curry. But that he and all of us, not excluding myself should have to gravitate about Kuhn Loeb and Co is symptomatic of the deplorable condition of the Jews and of the Judaism. The moneyed powers have no interest in Judaism except as a means of maintaining things in their status quo, and they are using us as tools. The Seminary and the Bureau of Education and the Kehillah are nothing but Jewish social pacifiers.

On Sunday, July 4, I was one of the speakers at the ceremonies attendant upon the laying of the corner stone of the Orthodox Synagogue of Far Rockaway. The other speakers were H. P. Mendes, Dr. Hyamson, Sam I. Hyman and the local rabbis. After a good deal of hard thinking, the day before, I contrived to say something effective. I never know how to take these oratorical successes. At the time the effort seems worthwhile, before and after it appears a sheer waste of energy.

On Tuesday, July 6 at 5:15 the meeting of the group of educationalists took place at my house. Present were Benderly, Handler,

Bragin, Ginzberg, Maximon. Two new men came, Margoshes and Silk. Levine who was supposed to lead in the discussion could not attend. I took his place and gave a resume of the lecture on the aim of Jewish Education. The discussion was quite animated, and only came to a conclusion when I made it clear that I was not interested in the conserving of any religion or "ism," but of the social life of our people. I also admitted that I was likely to be misunderstood so long as I insisted upon making religion coexistensive with every phase of our people's life. Margoshes suggested that we take up next time the discussion of the factors that made for the conservation of Jewry and of the extent to which those factors may still be deemed operative. The next meeting was set for Wednesday, August 18 at 3 P.M.

* * * *

Friday, August 6, 1915

On Sunday, July 11, I went to Arverne to attend the meeting of the United Synagogue. The gathering consisted of the Seminary Faculty, Dr. Adler, about two dozen Seminary graduates, about a dozen delegates and a few women. As a means of spending a vacation day, the convention was an excellent thing. In the afternoon nearly all of the time was spent discussing the question whether or not to accept the invitation of the American Jewish Committee to send delegates to the Conference which is to take place about the beginning of November to consider what action to take with reference to the Jews in the belligerent countries. When some of the members suggested that the acceptance of the invitation should not preclude the acceptance of a similar invitation from another body in view of the fact that the Provisional Zionist Committee was getting ready to send out a call for a Congress, Adler protested indignantly on the ground that to accept any other invitation was an insult to the A.J.C. and he stated that he for one would have to resign from the chairmanship if a resolution to that effect were passed. The discussion was a times quite sharp and heated and on the

whole it enabled the convention to forget that two of the most important committees had no report to bring in, the Education Committee and the one on Relation of United Synagogue to Institutions of Higher Learning, of which Drs. Greenstone and Ginzberg were chairmen.

In the evening a banquet was held. The usual string of talk about peace and harmony constituted the spiritual food.

Next day the business of the convention, or whatever there was of it, was concluded. In the afternoon and evening the alumni met. Ginzberg spoke on the Halacha as a source of history. It was a rather stimulating talk, though in his usual style of administering a few sneering thrusts at speakers and at his colleagues in the faculty. His soul seems to be as small as his body and its music as ~~rough~~ squeaky as his voice. There is no room in it for spiritual resonance. I forgot to mention that Schechter preceded him with a talk on the function of the rabbi. He too managed to prove how small he could be by resorting to a veiled attack on Magnes as an illustration of what a rabbi should not be. He described him as a "rabbi at large," whose main business is collecting money to put down vice.

For the first time in the history of the alumni a feeling of dissatisfaction with the treatment they received at the hands of the Seminary was voiced, though weakly and with circumspection. In the evening Hirshman read a lugubrious paper that seemed little more than a translation~~xx~~ of portions from the ~~xxx~~. Among the resolutions passed that night I consider as significant the one to the effect that an attempt be made to work out a sort of ethical code that men in the pulpit ought to abide by, in the matter of applying for positions.

* * * *

Saturday, September 4, 1915

The following incidents among those that transpired since last I wrote into this book are the following:

After urging upon Dr. Benderly a number of times that he take some steps to organize the private tuition, he suggested that associations of parents be formed in different parts of the city, whose object it should be to take in hand the matter of private tuition as far as it affects their respective localities. The only difference between an association of that kind and a Talmud Torah association is that the former would not have to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a building. He furthermore suggested that for the present a start be made with the community on the West Side where some of my friends live. Accordingly, I went at once to see Joseph H. Cohen in his shop on Fifth Ave. and 35 Street. When I came up to the loft where his shop is situated, I was shown into a little office, where were present partners, bookkeepers, salesmen and waited a little while until Cohen called me out. As I passed through the show room I saw there the usual activity of fitting on different styles upon the "models," the whole atmosphere was by no means in rapport with the plan I was going to propose to Cohen. We found at last some secluded corner among the tables laden with goods and both of us in a standing position went over the entire matter in about 15 minutes. I could see that business was pressing all the time and I was as brief and to the point as possible. He approved very strongly of the entire idea, but he suggested that some other neighborhood be tried because the people of his neighborhood who would be interested in furthering that idea, are at present engaged in establishing the Jewish Centre. He advised that I sound some of the people who live on Washington Heights.

It occurred to me that I knew a young man who lived there by the name of Arthur Lamport, a son of a man who came to this country some thirty odd years ago and who has since grown quite rich. This

Arthur Lamport is one of the firm established by the father. Its dealings are with cotton goods. I met Arthur for the first time a little over a year ago at the wedding of his brother Charles S. The family is one of those who came over here with the first tide of east European immigration and which have risen to considerable competence. The father is quite a clever man of the old school. Descended from a rabbinic family he is possessed both of the ability and the desire to pursue the old studies of his Yeshiva days. Of modern culture the man knows only enough to consider it fatal to what he considers Judaism. His idealism expresses itself and exhausts itself within the "four ells" of the synagogal life. Outside of that he is a crass materialist and as I have heard, not observant of any of the higher standards in business.

His sons are not of the usual dissolute type of some of the sons of Russian Jewish immigrants like their father. They are too clever for that. They are ambitious money makers. The little of Judaism that they still are at heart loyal too is that which they identify with the idealism which they had observed in their parents' home in connection with ritual, synagogue and charity. As regards the larger and more strenuous issues of life they consider as entirely irrelevant to Judaism. Nevertheless of late it seems to have dawned upon them that Judaism was something bigger than the domestic traditions to which they had always considered it as confined. This is due to the nationalistic movement as I had occasion to infer from occasion remarks dropped by Charles S. Another and more personal influence which seems to have determined their outlook upon Judaism has been that of Dr. Schechter who evidently was attracted by something in their manner to cause him to take kindly to them. As a consequence of their more sympathetic attitude towards Judaism they have begun to take a share in communal activity. Charles S. is connected with various Jewish institutions and Arthur is president of the congregation at Washington Heights.

When I entered the store I found Arthur selling goods to two people to whom he spoke Spanish. He asked them to ~~wait~~ wait, and took me into his office where I laid my suggestion before him. He threw cold water upon the entire idea. He personally was not interested in furthering such a plan, said he, because he paid a private teacher \$1.00 or \$1.50 a lesson (I don't recall which) a far higher sum than any of his friends in that neighborhood would ever think of spending and he is satisfied that he gets the desired results. As regards the other people, he was sure the suggestion would not work because they were entirely apathetic to having their children brought up Jewishly. He spoke of the school which was being conducted by the congregation of which, as he expressed he happened unfortunately to be the head, and described the venture as a most discouraging one. The people are so indifferent that they cannot be gotten to attend to any of the work of organization. Others again went so far as to protest against having their children attracted by various inducements to the religious school. They objected to having their children "kidnapped" by means of candy and ice-cream because they do not want their children to be bothered with useless things. When in reply to his complainings I said that as Jews we cannot afford to be discouraged by difficulties of that kind since in a sense to be a Jew involves a great deal of discomfort, he retorted, If you open the door, I enter, meaning that he found being a Jew a very uncomfortable thing. I went away from him chopfallen not only as regards my particular proposition but also as regards the very existence of Judaism in this country.

* * *

Wednesday, September 15, 1915

When I was to see Schechter about two weeks ago he repeated to me what he had said in the beginning of the summer in reference to my entering the field of scholarship. As he put it, "I ought to get into the ring." He hinted darkly that it was a necessary condition to my attaining something higher. He did not say what.

On the second day of Rosh Hashana (Sept. 10) I preached at the Y.M.H.A. on the need of having a standard in Jewish life. I urged the importance of neighborhood community as means of developing such standards.

Yesterday I attended a meeting called by Herbert M. Straus for the purpose of getting the directors and associate directors to engage in a house to house campaign for members. It was not so much the zeal for the institution that activated Straus as the desire to please F. M. Warburg who had expressed his displeasure at the failure of the directors to add to the membership list. He even intimated that he would give up the chairmanship if that indifference continued. The lunch that was served at the Manhattan Club, 26 St. & Madison Ave. consisted of oysters on shells and chicken. My stomach turned at the sight of some of our "køiks", Shulman among them enjoying their repast. There were not missing the two youngsters who are presented at every joint meeting of this kind as the product of the Y.M.H.A. and as samples of the institution is turning out like two well bred pups.

A meeting of the faculty of the Jewish Communal School was called for 12:00 noon today at the rooms of the Bureau of Education. Present were Benderly, Goldwasser, Bernstein, Abelson, Bressler, Waldman, Friedlaender, Aminsky and myself. The greater part of the session was spent in discussing the point I had raised ^{about} of the need of a common understanding among the men of the faculty as to the direction that we believe Jewish life ought to take. I argued that so long as some of us believed that the survivalist tendency ought to be encouraged, while others regarded it only as a transitional stage in the life of our people who are in the end to be entirely amalgamated, we can not but give the students a confused view of the situation as a whole. I therefore advocated that we discuss at our meetings the attitude that we

ought to take towards the Jewish communal life. This was strenuously opposed by most of the men, especially Goldwasser, who even when the rest voted to devote the second hour of each bimonthly meeting to the discussion of the communal problem, insisted upon having his name registered against any attempt towards establishing a common platform for the men on the faculty.

* * * *

Monday, October 4, 1915

I attended services during the holidays at the 85 St. synagogue.

Yesterday the Seminary opened. Dr. Schechter devoted part of his remarks to a tirade against those who try to "reinterpret" the terms personal God and revelation.

* * * *

Sunday, October 31, 1915

Last Friday I gave my first lecture at Teachers College in the course on the Religious Interpretation of the Bible. The following were the circumstances that led to my giving the course: The members of the Special Class of the Teachers Institute who concurrently have been taking work at the Teachers College have been the moving spirits in a Jewish organization at the College known as the Jewish Forum, which is supposed to do work analogous to that of the Y.M.C.A. This year Dushkind is at the head of it and it was he with a few others who conceived the idea of asking the authorities to have courses in religious education parallel to those which are being given there from the Christian standpoint. Sometime in August he asked me whether I would undertake to give two half year courses, one in Biblical the other in Post-Biblical literature. I accepted his proposal. He forthwith set about procuring the cooperation of Prof. Gottheil who is the faculty adviser to the Forum in order to have the petition presented to the Dean and my name suggested as the eligible lecturer. On Shmini Atzereth Gottheil had me call on him and I explained to him the nature of the

courses that I would give. The Tuesday after that Warburg saw me at an executive committee meeting of the Y.M.H.A. immediately after he had come from a Trustee meeting of the College, and he apprised me of the fact that my name was proposed and passed upon as lecturer in Religious Education. The Friday following I received formal notice from Dean Russell that I was appointed for the year 1915-1916 without salary. Everything thus went smoothly with the exception of a slight hitch towards the end, partly through my own fault. In my anxiety to have the Seminary contribute that course through me, I suggested to Dushkind that he get the consent of Schechter. Upon receiving his letter, however, Schechter was going to suggest Friedlaender, thinking that the one who taught Bible in the Seminary was the logical person to give the course in Teachers College. Furthermore, as he ~~xxxx~~ explained to Friedlaender, he was afraid that I would be too rationalistic in my presentation. But to his chagrin the matter had already been decided upon without the Seminary being consulted. The matter was therefore left to take its course, and I remained in the field. Two weeks ago the students met to fix the time when the course should be given. The hour which suited most of those present was Friday 11-12.

Last Thursday night I attended a testimonial dinner given to Warburg by the directors of the Y.M.H.A. in honor of his completing seven years of ^{presidency} ~~xxxxxx~~ of the Y.M.H.A. The occasion for that dinner was the outcome of a silent campaign for membership which brought in an additional \$4200 annually headed by Herbert N. Strauss. The dinner was given at the Ritz-Carlton, Madison Ave. at 46 St. at eight dollars a plate. There were forty men present including Mr. Schiff who had been specially invited for the occasion. I was the first one to be called upon to speak. In the course of the evening Schiff was called upon to speak. He delivered a tirade against Brandeis, and against Jewish

nationalism. He spoke for the press rather than to the actual audience, because no one there ever manifested the least inclination to side with Jewish nationalism. He thundered forth that religion should be the only bond uniting us. The oddity of such a claim struck me with peculiar force that evening when not the slightest deference was paid to any religious scruple or formality except, as I learned afterwards, for the recitation of the ~~Shema~~. Schiff himself remarked to me in the course of the meal as he pointed to the shellfish in his plate. "This is a Young Men's Hebrew Association." How little he understands the religious life of our people, I could see from the fact that when I mentioned the United Synagogue to him he professed complete ignorance ~~as to its existence~~ as to its existence. In parting from him he said to me that he did not suppose I agreed with what he had said. My reply was that he could hardly expect me to.

On Thursday, October 21 I was at Joseph H. Cohen's place of business to look over the plans for a building of the Jewish Center of the West Side. Fishman was also present besides the architect. I gathered that he was at the head of the movement, though of course Cohen is the actual mover in the entire affair. He told me to be prepared to take the position of leader as soon as the building would be completed, and he advised me also to take steps about offering a prize of \$500 for the best ritual poems to be composed for the coming High Holidays.

* * *

Monday, November 15, 1915

I was at Boston over "Shabbos" having gone there at the invitation of Rabbi Rubenowitz. I was scheduled to speak on the Jewish Renaissance. Being hard up to get an audience he is trying to revise various ways of getting one together every Friday night. His congregation "Mishkan Tefila, is among the oldest in Boston, but it seems to have

little vitality at the present. The synagogue they worship in was formerly a church and it still retains the church paraphernalia. I refer particularly to the organ. When the congregation bought the church they were still quite orthodox and never made use of the organ at the services. This year, however, Rabbi Rubenowitz, although himself quite orthodox, when he left the Seminary, came to the conclusion that it was proper to have organ music in the service. He expects^{that}/the introduction of the organ would attract many of his members who have kept away from the synagogue. I understand, however, that so far the only effect it has had has been to drive away a number of those who had been in the habit of attending Sabbath services. In addition to these innovations Rubenowitz organized a sort of Men's Club and has one Friday night service a month conducted, as it were, under their auspices. There are to be five such services during the winter, and each one is to be addressed by a different speaker. I was the one to start the series. When I came there I found about $\frac{1}{2}$ a hundred people, men and women. After a florid introduction by the president I gave my address which was followed by a most flattering tribute paid me by Rubenowitz.

The next morning I repaired to his synagogue about 10:00 and found about forty worshippers, twenty-four men and the rest women. Most of them were quite advanced in years. I understand that during weekdays they secure a minyan by paying seven of them to come. I suppose that these seven were also there Sabbath morning. Rubenowitz asked me to address the children who, he said, would be led to the synagogue after the reading of the Torah from their classrooms where they were being taught at the time. There were about ninety of them, boys and girls, many of whom were hardly more than infants. In my talk I spoke to them as follows: You do not like to go to bed when night comes around. But as soon as you put your heads to the pillows you go off into dreamland. In the morning you remember some of the things you saw there, but you hardly think dreams are important enough to be written

down in books. Yet in the Bible we find that dreams did sometimes play a very important part. For example, that of Pharoah or the Babylonian king. But both of those dreams had their interpretations. This was not the case with the dream of Jacob which did not receive its interpretation in the Bible because in every age it receives a new interpretation. Thus a new interpretation became clear to me that very morning as I went into the synagogue and found but few people there. It seemed to me that the spirit of Israel found itself once again in the condition of Jacob in the wilderness. Just as the latter presented a dismal contrast to the first patriarch whom God had promised to make into a great nation so do the few worshippers present a sad contrast to the Israel of former days. They are to the spirit of Israel what the ~~g~~ stones were to Jacob, a means of keeping the wild beasts away, of warding off the destructive influences from him, but not enough to offset the solitude and desolateness of the situation. But as I sat and beheld the children file into the synagogue from their classrooms upstairs, it appeared to me as though the spirit of Israel was dreaming over again the vision of the angels that kindled in him once again the hope of a great future. I then said to the children, "You see then what you mean to us Jews, you are the angels to whom we look to bring us the message of joy and hope of a great Israel in the future."

* * *

Wednesday, November 17, 1915

On Sunday night I attended the 2nd annual meeting of the Council of Y.M.H.A. and Kindred Assns. at Mr. Felix M. Warburg's house. Judge Mack acted as chairman. Besides him and Warburg there were Goldwasser and his four lieutenants, a man by the name of Rosendale who seemed to be particularly interested in the Army and Navy Y.M.H.A. work, Dr. Benderly, Mr. Fischel, Mr. Ellis from Boston, Mr. Abraham Cohen from Scranton, Hassler from Philadelphia, Mrs. Unterberg, Mr. Adolph Levinsohn and three or four others. The greater part of the meeting was taken up

with the reports read by Goldwasser and his lieutenants (field workers.). The reports created a very good impression because those who listened to them were uncritical and were carried away by the bulk and detail which had a cumulative effect. Warburg expressed himself that none of his investments (philanthropic) brought in such returns. On the other hand, Benderly was correct in describing to me those reports as practically amounting to no more than if they stated that the chairs which stood in one end of the room were transferred to another. Most of the work for which those that reported took credit was actually carried out by the local organizations. All that the workers seemed to have done in most cases was to pay a visit or two and become acquainted with the facts so as to have what to report. Of course, here and there they might have done some ~~gan~~ organization work, but by no means commensurate with the amount ~~of~~ spent - viz., \$11000. Neither Goldwasser nor those who contribute towards the work have any definite aim or conception that they want to accomplish. Adolph Levinson, for example, who came in after the meeting was half over, sat impatiently through the proceedings, asked a few questions which showed he had only a faint notion of what went on, promised to contribute \$1000 a year for the next three years and left long before the meeting was adjourned. A very striking fact was brought out with reference to a large number of so called Y.M.H.A. Associations throughout the country and that is that they are practically nothing more than gambling clubs using the Y.M.H.A name as a shield. The field workers reported that they were making efforts to prohibit the use of the name. This evil is very general throughout the state of Pennsylvania in the mining district. Another of the field workers reported that he tried to have the Y.M.H.A. and Y.W.H.A. come together wherever they existed in one town, so as to have the Jewish young men marry within their own people instead of intermarrying with the non-Jewish population with whom, under present circumstances, they chiefly associate.

Magnes became the chairman of the religious work in the Association, and he raised the hopes of Warburg and one or two others that he would revolutionize conditions at the Y.M.H.A. and bring new life into its activities which had already then been lagging for some time. In consistency with his daunting down the organ at the Madison Avenue Congregation which he then held, Magnes insisted upon its exclusion from the services at the Association. He attempted to organize a congregation out of the young men but failed, because he had neither

Magnes became the chairman of the religious work in the Association, and he raised the hopes of Warburg and one or two others that he would revolutionize conditions at the Y.M.H.A. and bring new life into its activities which had already then been lagging for some time. In consistency with his shutting down the organ at the Madison Avenue Congregation which he then held, Magnes insisted upon its exclusion from the services at the Association. He attempted to organize a congregation out of the young men but failed, because he had neither

Magnes became the chairman of the religious work in the Association, and he raised the hopes of Warburg and one or two others that he would revolutionize conditions at the Y.M.H.A. and bring new life into its activities which had already then been lagging for some time. In consistency with his dautting down the organ at the Madison Avenue Congregation which he then held, Magnes insisted upon its exclusion from the services at the Association. He attempted to argonize a congregation out of tae young men but failed, because he had neither

How little the organizers of these associations have as a rule any definite aim besides providing meeting places for young people, and imitating the non-Jews with their Y.M.C.A.'s was brought out clearly when Cohen, the representative from Scranton, exultantly related the experiences of his association there which has succeeded in collecting \$53000 and has proceeded to put up a \$98000 building. Of about 1475 contributors, he said 600 were Gentiles. The Catholic priest in one of the churches went so far as to exhort his people to support the movement. I cannot vouch for the exact truth of this but the Catholics probably found it to their advantage to encourage this movement among the Jews so that they might afterwards have good grounds for establishing similar institutions for their own people. The whole show impressed me as a remarkable combination of efficiency and humbug.

* * * *

Thursday, November 18, 1915

This morning I had occasion to see Dr. Schechter about some personal matter. We happened to speak about the meetings of the Seminary Trustees. He complained bitterly of the lack of interest in the Seminary on the part of men like Warburg. This led up to the old yet ever fresh topic of the little recognition that Seminary receives from our leading Jews whose chief interests are taken up with social work. Dr. Schechter said that he was afraid to invite any one to lecture on matters of a philanthropical character -- a series of such lectures has been given for some years at the Seminary -- because many of the lecturers make it their business to introduce their remarks by pointing out their aloofness from the Seminary and what it stands for. I mentioned to him that the Y.M.H.A. holds meetings every other week that are well attended, and the trivial nature of the matters discussed at those meetings. He then went on to say that he sometimes is so depressed when he thinks of how he has been forced into competition with

Monday, November 22, 1915

This morning a little after 10 the students were assembled in the classroom where they were wont to meet Dr. Schechter, and were addressed by Dr. Ginzberg. The purpose in holding this formal assembly was to announce to the students that there would be no sessions during the "Shivah". "Without this formality," Dr. Ginzberg remarked to me, "they might look upon their exemption from study as a holiday." Personally, I do not see how his apprehensions were removed by the mere holding of a formal assembly. The remarks which Ginzberg made were quite appropriate and impressive. He began by ~~quoting~~ quoting the saying "The reward for visiting the house of mourning is silence." If speech makes man the crown of creation silence brings him nearer to the world of spirits", etc. etc. He referred incidentally to belief in immortality and resurrection, implying that he cherished it.

* * *

Wednesday, December 15, 1915

Selma ~~born~~ whom we named after Solomon Schechter, was born on Monday, December 6 at 7:25 P.M. ~~1915~~

* * *

Wednesday, January 19, 1916

But few things worthy of note have transpired since I last wrote into this book. On Sunday, Dec. 12 at 2 P.M. I addressed a group of about three hundred high-school boys which Chipkin has been trying to organize on the same lines that the Bureau has organized nearly a thousand high school girls. The principle of organization is to have them divided into clubs each one with a definite schedule of Jewish work. I opened my remarks with a comparison between the gathering of groups of boys of that kind here and abroad at this time. Though gotten together under more auspicious circumstances that gathering none the less represented a form of mobilization, in this case the

mobilization of the resources of the Jewish soul. While the resources of an army are its infantry, artillery, cavalry, the resources of the Jewish soul are quite of a different character, viz., self-knowledge, self-respect and self-control. I developed the ideas along the lines of the sermon I had given at the Orach Chayim Synagogue on Sabbath Hanukah (Dec. 4). I spoke there at the request of Dr. Hyamson who was prevented from occupying his pulpit on account of an accident he had met with while returning from the Schechter's the night before the funeral. In referring to self-control I spoke of the additional strength and incentive that each one was to receive by reason of his affiliation with such a group. Each was to be strong not alone with his own strength but with the strength of all.

The boys listened attentively. They impressed me, on the whole, as a very serious group. I was followed on the program by a man named Mason, a Jewish high-school teacher who, I understand, is a great favorite with the boys. His address was rather colorless; especially conspicuous was the omission of all reference to their having come together for distinctively Jewish purposes. I recall only two of the three virtues he urged upon them, namely cosmopolitanism and service.

* On Monday, Jan. 3, the Seminary held memorial exercises ~~in~~ at the Aeolian Hall in honor of Dr. Schechter. Schiff presided and the following were the speakers: Marshall who represented the Board of Trustees, gave a lengthy address which consisted mostly of quotations from Schechter's writings; Prof. Ginzberg, who spoke on behalf of the faculty was quite good, but inaudible; Rabbi C. I. Hoffman was too studied in his delivery, and Lissauer who represented the students, delivered his piece without any break. On the whole it was a stiff and formal affair without much heart or genuine feeling.

Some time ago Miss J. Sampter came to see me about a plan she had in mind of organizing Zionists on a religious basis. I mentioned to her the fact that I had had a small group of young people coming to the house the year before last, but that I had discontinued it for lack of time. I promised her, however, that I would be ready to undertake the working of organizing such a group if I could count upon her assistance. Accordingly our first meeting took place in one of the rooms of the Y.M.H.A. building on Saturday, Jan. 8 at 4 P.M. Present were, besides myself, Dushkin, Ginzberg, Elisha Friedman, Drachsler, Crohn, Rabbi Robison and Miss Seligsberg and Miss Sampter. I sought to impress upon those present the need of a group which would strive to formulate and live the kind of Judaism that might indicate the line of development which Judaism must take in this country if it is to survive the social and intellectual influences which are disintegrating Jewish life. I furthermore made them understand that it was essential that we form that group not merely out of a desire to express ourselves socially or intellectually, but also religiously. We should enter this group, I urged, with the intention of discharging the debt which we owe to our people, viz., that of devoting some of our time and thought toward the consideration of those problems upon the solution of which the continued existence of our people depends. We determined to meet every Sabbath afternoon. For the present our meeting place is to be at the Y.W.H.A. In the meantime another member was added to our group, a woman by the name of Mrs. Guggenheimer. She was told to come to see me before joining the group. She is a thin nervous sharp featured little woman. She said that her husband was a "fatalist," cared nothing about Judaism, and I inferred that he seemed annoyed by her eagerness to introduce a more Jewish life into her home. She has an only daughter who seems to take after her father. In the case of the mother it seems to be a hankering after the mode of life she has been accustomed to in her childhood. Her

grandparents had been extremely orthodox, and to some extent also her parents. When I asked her what had brought her back to Judaism after she had drifted away from it, her reply was that it had been Zionism. She realized that conditions here made for assimilation, and she found consolation in Zionism. -- The group met again last Sabbath afternoon (Jan. 15.) Ginzberg was absent on account of his not having been informed of the meeting place. Besides the additional member, Mrs. Guggenheimer, there was also Lotta Levensohn, one of the first graduates from the Institute.

Y.W.H.A.

On Friday, December 24 I spoke at the ~~Y.M.H.A.~~ services on the Bible and the Duty of Studying it. On Friday, Jan. 14 I spoke at the Y.M.H.A. on "Anonymous Judaism." This was the last of a series on the different interpretations of Judaism, viz., Reform, Orthodox, Conservative and National. The following is the substance of my remarks: Some were apprehensive that the results of having the different conceptions of Judaism presented in this way would be that it would tend to exempt the hearers from taking sides altogether. It is not so in practical life. For example, we do not refrain from voting because of the different parties that interpret Americansim differently. But in Judaism anything is liable to serve as an excuse. To offset such a possibility I present Anonymous Judaism by which I wish to point out that there ~~ix~~ are common elements underlying them all. Now when Judaism is in danger of being swamped we should not emphasize the differences between the different conceptions of Judaism, but the elements whereupon they all agree. It is not a question of being an orthodox, reformed or other type of Jew. With many it is a question whether they should be Jews at all.

Probably if we wanted to know which is the right kind of Judaism we would have to resort to a composite picture made up of the various types of it which exist at present. Cf. the story of the Elephant and the blind men.

These elements which are common to the different kinds of Judaism are by no means negative or colorless in character. They are the following: 1) Unity of Israel, as exhibited by the retention of some Hebrew even by the most radical, the bond of sympathy with our brethren in Europe, the interest manifested by anti-Zionist in Zionist undertakings; 2) The duty of living in Jewish community - affiliation with a stable organization which stands for Judaism. Being unattached ~~is~~ is unJewish, whether the person himself be orthodox or reformed in his convictions and 3) the duty of fostering Jewish continuity through Jewish education.

Last Sunday, Jan. 16 I attended the annual meeting and dinner of the Y.M.H.A. There was the usual palaver on the part of the speakers. The first one to speak was Herbert Straus, who has been thought of by many of the directors as a suitable candidate for the presidency which is to be left vacant on account of Warburg resigning. He spoke very poorly, particularly when he had to mention the religious work, then he was all flustered. He could not find words enough to explain or justify that activity, for, as I understand, he is on principle opposed to all religion. Judge Leventutt delivered for an interminably long period a lecture on character. The people had to do all they could to hold themselves from laughing. Mayor Mitchel spoke more in accord with the spirit of a Jewish institution than the rest, but then he branched off on political questions. On the whole he spoke quite well.

Monday, (Jan. 17) I was in Baltimore where I addressed a Jewish Women's Organization on the subject the Meaning of Jewish Education, based to a large extent, on my article on the Function of the Religious Schools, except that I drew further conclusions from the principle laid down there and applied them to the problems suggested by the practice of private tuition, by the introduction of Hebrew into the curriculum, by the study of history of the Bible, and by the inadequacy of a religious

training which does not cover the years of adolescence.

* * *

Sunday, January 23, 1916

Yesterday afternoon the subject for discussion at the Sabbath Afternoon Group was "The Meaning of Religion." My purpose was not to determine the essence of religion, but to decide upon a meaning which we shall all try to keep in mind throughout our discussions and which will at the same time help to make those discussions fruitful. I pointed out that we must determine the nature of the two ? around which the religious life revolved, viz., the relation of individual to social and the relation of supernatural to natural. The discussion was somewhat rambling at first, but I succeeded in pointing out to the members how deeply rooted was the tendency to dissect the religious state of mind of the individual on its cognitive emotional and voluntaristic sides, whenever we want to get at the meaning of religion, ~~xx~~ to overlook the social phase entirely. Thus, Elisha M. Friedman dilated on the fact that religion places the sanction of conduct outside of experience. Alexander Dushkin on the fact that religion is the terra incognita of human experience. It was only after I pointed out the usual tendency to ignore the social aspect that Miss Jessie Sampter suggested that religion is the unity of aim which a social group develops whereby each individual in it shall attain the highest degree of perfection. The following are the Temporary By-^uaws which have been adopted:

Principles of Organization.

1. The purpose of this group shall be to bring within the bond of fellowship American Jews and Jewesses who wish to make Judaism function in their lives as an incentive to spiritual endeavor.

2. It aims to determine through study, deliberation and discussion that mode of Jewish life which is compatible with the main social, economic and intellectual needs of life in America.

3. No one shall be admitted to this group who would not have the Jews continue as a distinct people, or who would deprecate the establishment of a Jewish national center in Palestine.

4. The members of this group shall be morally bound to carry out in their own lives those principles and practices which the group shall declare essential to Judaism in America.

5. The group shall have such ritual expression of its organized life as it shall see fit to adopt from time to time.

Rules of Government:

1. The group shall meet every Sabbath afternoon.

2. The affairs of this group shall be conducted by a committee of three whose chairman shall act as the Leader of the group.

3. New members shall be admitted as follows: The name of the applicant shall be presented before the group at one of its sessions and the person suggested shall be interviewed by one or more members of the committee, unless he or she is personally known to all the members of the group. Upon the report of the committee the group shall vote on the admission of the applicant. The new member shall not, however, be received officially until he or she shall have attended four of its meetings.

The Committee of three consists of myself, E. Friedman and Miss Sampter.

During the middle of last week ~~Ruker~~ Dukas, the main pillar of the Orach Chayim Congregation, called me upon the telephone and said to me that he had a great surprise in store for me if I would come down to the Yeshibath Jacob Joseph of which he is president the next Saturday night, referring to last night. Upon further inquiry I learned from him that he had called together the Alumni of the Yeshiba, or as many as he could get together and wanted me to do something with them so as to have them continue their Jewish studies in the Yeshiba. He

thought I might train them to become teachers. In any case he would not hear of any refusal on my part and I had to promise that I would do what I could.

Knowing that Dr. Benderly had through Mr. Broggin selected the available graduates of that school for the Boys High School courses that he has been organizing, I told Dr. B. about Dukas' conversation with me, and he suggested that I have printed questionnaires along with me to obtain from the boys whatever information I considered necessary. Accordingly I came provided with questionnaires and pencils to the meeting of the alumni. When Dukas and I walked into the room where the meeting was taking place there was a great deal of handclapping. I don't know for whom it was intended. Dukas came in evening dress because he had to go to some ball given at the Plaza for some charity benefit, and as soon as he entered began telling the boys how glad he was to see so many of them, how he loved them and that they should be sure to come again. He promised he would do everything in his power for them; he would help them earn money by being teachers, and that I would organize them and give them the necessary training. At the mention of money the boys applauded to the echo. The chairman asked me whether I wanted to speak to them at once, or I preferred to have them carry on the discussion in which they had been engaged before we entered the room. I told him that I ~~am~~ wanted to hear what they had to say so that I might be better informed as to their expectations. One of them got up and orated for about fifteen minutes without giving me a definite idea of what they wanted. I recognized him as one of the students of the Junior Department in the Seminary, who seizes every possible opportunity to display his eloquence. The chairman himself then took the floor and while he berated the preceding speaker for his indefiniteness was not more illuminating himself. In the meantime Dukas was marching up and down the room counting the number present and it was with a great deal of glee that he reported to me there were 93. He interrupted the

the proceedings by asking the boys to pledge themselves to come next week, and he actually made them stand up to indicate their promise. The protests of some of them that they must have some concrete object or interest to bring them there before they can promise was unavailing. He told them his address and asked them to write to him if they wanted anything. I finally distributed the questionnaires, and from the information which I obtained in that way I saw that it was a most motley and heterogeneous mass of boys ranging from the age of $13\frac{1}{2}$ to 22. Of the 88 replies, about half intended or had already gone into business. Most of the rest wanted to take up a profession but were not decided as to what it should be. The former could spare only about one or two evenings a week on Jewish studies.

Realizing that I was expected to say something to the boys I seized upon the fact that Dukas had to hold out to them the prospects of earning money by means of teaching as a bait to their continuing their Jewish studies. It was a revolting spectacle to see those fellows appealed to on the materialistic side of their nature, without the slightest allusion to the more idealistic phase of the study of the Torah for its own sake, either on the part of Dukas or the boys. I saw at once the crudity and the worthlessness of the kind of Jewish education they have been receiving in that institution reflected in their attitude towards their continuance of Jewish studies. I roundly denounced the spirit in which they viewed the whole matter. I was convinced that I was not wrong in viewing that spirit as a reflection of their training. An elderly man, who I was told was the principal, got up right after me and with a sophistry of which the Talmudist is master, tried to prove that I was not altogether right in expecting the boys to be so idealistic. Later on when I rode home with Dukas and I remarked that the principal should not have tried to neutralize what I said, he replied Of course not, if any one was to feel hurt, it was I; yet, I thought you were right. I wanted to know why Dr. Hyamson, his rabbi,

did not take more interest in the Yeshiba. Surely with the \$40,000 a year which they spend they ought to have been able to do very effective work. His reply was that the rabbi nowadays is more interested in attending engagements of couples in order to be asked to officiate at their weddings and that they are careful to look through the papers to find out where such engagements take place. I could see that he was quite disappointed in his rabbi, and I did not press the matter any further.

* * * * *

Saturday Night, June 17, 1916

I do not know to what to attribute my negligence in failing to record any of my experiences since I last wrote in this book. On the whole I was no busier than usual. The only reason, perhaps, is that I was under the obligation to complete the series of articles on Judaism that I was writing for the Menorah. Whenever I have to work out an article or an address, I am practically incapacitated for anything else.

My work at the Institute during the last few months was of a varied and interesting character. Till last March the classes of the Institute met at the Down Town Talmud Torah and at the Uptown Talmud Torah. To accommodate the students most of the work had to be done Down Town. Though the authorities of the Talmud Torah did not interfere with us in any way, in fact, and let us come and go at our pleasure, we were very much inconvenienced by the social and educational work which was carried on at the building, and which often necessitated our going from room to room before we could conduct our classes. It was about two or three years ago that I learned that the Loeb family together with Warburg (7) intended building an annex to the Hebrew Technical Institute at 36 Stuyvesant Street. I thereupon drew up a letter to Warburg in which I pointed out the difficulties under which the Institute labored by reason of lack of quarters of its own. Warburg was impressed by my representations, and made arrangements with the Loeb family to have a floor in the new building reserved for the uses of

the Institute. Accordingly I was called in to approve the plans for the floor on which the Institute was to hold its classes. Not being experienced in building plans, I approved of something which when actually built looked bizarre and was entirely useless for our purposes. I refer to a ~~xxx~~ triangular room that I thought might be used as a library and that I wanted to keep as large as possible. I therefore nodded approval when Bittenweiser the president of the Hebrew Tech. Inst. suggested that it be thrown together with the hallway which was to run from one end of the building to the other. When I came to see the building last fall I realized my mistake, and I insisted that some kind of a wall be put in and that the triangular room be divided into a classroom and office. The authorities complied with my request, though it meant considerable additional expense. I am extremely glad that they granted my wish, otherwise I should have been miserable every time I entered the Institute.

At last after a great deal of waiting I was able to transfer the classes to the new building the first week in March. With the contributions of my brothers-in-law, Max and Jake, I established the nucleus of a library. Max sent me \$1000 to establish an alcove in memory of Hermie who died last August, and Jake gave \$5000 as a fund the income of which was to be devoted to the increase of the library.

I am very grateful to Benderly for his suggestion that we hold a formal dedication of our new quarters and for his enabling me to carry it out successfully. In fact, I feel that if it were not for him I would have been entirely at a loss. He helped me to buy the furniture and he attended to the printing and sending out of notices. We issued a very impressive looking register. He has been of assistance to me in every way possible, and I keenly appreciate it.

I made arrangements for the dedication exercises to be held on Sunday April 16. The first thing I did was to make sure that Schiff would be present. I then wrote to Greenbaum asking him to be present

and deliver an address. After a great deal of bickering, because I went on with the arrangements without first consulting the Special Committee on Teachers Institute of which he is chairman, he at least promised to come. Marshall also promised to come. But when the exercises were held neither of them appeared. Those that took part in the program were Schiff, Adler, Magnes and myself. The audience was rather slim, due probably to the fact that it was the day before Erev Pesach, or that it was too bright and sunshiny to stay indoors. The students and alumni made a good showing. I had taken care to have a number of the former learn some Hebrew songs which they sang very well.

* * *

Sunday, June 18, 1916

For a long time I had entertained the idea that if the Teachers Institute would have a supporting membership like all institutions, instead of being dependent upon the one Mr. Schiff, its scope of activity could be enlarged. While Schecter was still alive I broached the idea to him, and I received both his and Marshall's permission to go out "schnorrng." I never had much heart for that sort of thing and I put it off from month to month, until last March when I picked up courage and went to see a number of people in their places of business and asked them to pledge themselves to contribute annually any sum that they cared to donate for a period of five years on condition that a regular membership body be organized. At first things looked rather promising. Joseph H. Cohen was the first to promise \$100 per annum, and he was followed in quick succession by Fishman Sadowsky and a few others. It did not take me long, however, to realize that it was no small task that I had undertaken. After a six week's canvass during which time I spent about twelve half-days I got together pledges for about \$1000. In the meantime the dedication exercises took up some of my time and I have grown reluctant to visit people who might refuse me. I have presented the matter to the Special Committee but instead of

taking action they have been extremely negligent, and no progress has been made.

The next matter I wish to record has to do with the Jewish Centre on the West Side. After the lapse of many months during which I had heard nothing about it, the undertaking came to life again. The organization purchased ground on West 86 Street. H. Cohen put himself once again in touch with me with a view to having me take charge of the institution when it was completed. As soon as I felt that I might actually be drawn into that position I regarded it as my duty to lay before Cohen my heterodoxical views. When, however, he asked me as to the practical form which those views would take on, if I were to assume charge of the position, I did not have the courage to go to the full length of what my attitude logically should have led me to state, but I confined myself to the statement that I should be exempted from holding any positive views about the seating of the sexes and about the organ. My contention was that there were more important issues than these in Judaism, and that if I were to insist upon these lesser issues, the more important ones would be obscured. Joseph H. Cohen, however, has been adamant to my suggestions. In spite of all my pleading he still insists that I ought to advocate the strict observance of the traditional forms of worship. In the meantime, I have practically come to the conclusion that I could not give up either the Institute or the Seminary for the West Side Institution, particularly for the reason that I can not have it conducted the way I should like to see it conducted. Cohen has been trying hard to sway me. He was to see me on the seventh day of Passover together with Fishman and Rothstein. But instead of flattering their orthodoxy I restated my attitude with considerable firmness. I learned from Cohen later on that they went away rather disappointed.

On Saturday June 10 Cohen invited me to his house, and when after a long conversation in which we were later on joined by Rothstein, Cohen asked me whether he could propose me as a member preparatory to my becoming director, I refused to give him an affirmative answer. The suggestion to have me made a director had come from me, when I had made up my mind that I would not become a salaried official of the institution. But now that I see that I may count upon a great deal of opposition to say nothing of the work that identifying myself with it would necessarily involve, I have grown cold to the idea of my having anything whatever to do with the institution. But as I have not taken any final step I may expect some interesting developments.

* * *

Tuesday, June 20, ¹⁹¹⁶ 1961

The Institution on 85 Street adjoining the synagogue was finally completed last Spring and the dedication took place on Sunday, May 21st. If it were not for Sam. I. Hyman the building would never have been put up. But what I cannot approve of is the policy which he has set on foot of developing it into a central meeting place for all sorts of Jewish organizations instead of making it into a social Jewish centre for the people of the neighborhood. During the month of March Friedlaender, Benderly and myself were invited to a conference with the directors of that institution to discuss the matter of appointing some one to take charge of the work. Of course it would have been foolish to advise them to take anyone else than Goldstein who is now the English speaking rabbi of 85 Street. Besides, Hyman had previously made up his mind about having Herbert Goldstein, and ^{we} were simply called in to second his wish. At that conference I reiterated my opinion that it ought not be made into an institution for the general public and that it ought not to appeal for members to people outside of the neighborhood. I did not expect to have my suggestion heeded, but I could not refrain from speaking my convictions. As a matter of fact, the very name

Central Jewish Institute has been given it lately. Originally it was incorporated under the name of ~~Yorkville~~ Yorkville Jewish Institute and Talmud Torah.

At the dedication exercises I was assigned to deliver an address in the morning when they had a Siyum Hasefer. The main part of the program was in the afternoon. I was not present, but I was told that there was a huge crowd. It was then that Schiff made the statement that brought down upon him the indignation of the whole East Side. He said that one of the main reasons the Jews were persecuted in Russia was that they kept themselves aloof from the rest of the population. At the Kehillah meeting which took place on Sunday, June 4, he formally denied ever having made such a statement. What he did say was that if the Russian government had not kept the Jews aloof, I have heard on good authority that he actually said what he was first reported to have said. But, inasmuch as I have not heard him myself I can form no opinion on the matter. I have of late myself had experience with the "Times" and have come to realize with what irresponsibility they gather news items of this kind. One can, therefore, place little stock in what the "Times" had to say the day after the dedication of the Central Jewish Institute.

* * *

Thursday, June 29, 1916

The course at Teachers College worked out quite successfully. In the thirty hours that I gave I covered the Bible as far as Isaiah. The attendance dwindled down somewhat but on the whole it kept up as well as most courses of that kind in Columbia. The regular attendants at the class were sixteen. The examination was taken by twelve. I found, however, that the course was of benefit mostly to those who had taken work with me at the Institute. The few students from Barnard and Columbia who had work of this kind for the first time were scarcely

able to follow me. They had no knowledge of the text. Of what value could my interpretation be to them?

I received a letter from the authorities at Teachers College asking me whether I would give the course next year on the same terms as this year, which means gratis. I replied in the affirmative. I shall have to give two courses next year, one in Biblical Literature; the other on post-Biblical Literature.

The only item of interest in the Y.M.H.A. is the change in the presidency. Felix M. Warburg gave up the presidency because he is to become president of the Federation of Charities which is being organized in New York at the present time. He recommended to the board that they elect Judge Irving Lehman and his recommendation was accepted. Judge Lehman is a son-in-law of Nathan Straus who is quite an ardent Zionist and "Congress" man. Lehman is rather tall and somewhat stooping, bald headed, face rather elongated, clean-shaven, dark complexioned and dark eyed. He gives one the impression of being quite earnest and thorough in whatever he undertakes. He is rather hard of hearing and talks in a somewhat muffled voice, but he has no difficulty in grasping a new situation or seeing your point. I have occasion to meet him frequently in connection with the Teachers Institute. He is one of the Special Committee of which Judge Greenbaum is chairman. While Greenbaum is remarkably thick headed and unimaginative when it comes to matters such as the Institute deals with, I have found Lehman amenable to reason.

Lehman's ability has already shown itself in his quick grasp of the situation at the Y.M.H.A. He is mentally far superior to Warburg whom Friedlaender characterizes as the "Eidam." He differs also from the latter in a more genuine and intrinsic interest in Judaism as such, though, of course, he is far from being what may be called a Jewish Jew. On the Friday night before he was formally installed into the presidency he occupied the pulpit. He gave one of the usually colorless talks about

Judaism. It is a custom introduced lately at the Y.M.H.A. to have a social hour after the services at which the one who had occupied the pulpit is asked questions in connection with his discourse. One of the questions that Lehman was asked was about Zionism. He expressed himself as opposed to it. He made the statement that every part of the world should be equally sacred to the Jew. I felt it my duty not to allow his attitude to be regarded as official and representative, and I made a few remarks rebutting what he had said. Later on in discussing personally with him, he said that he favored Zionism only as long as it remained ~~an ideal~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ and a vague striving, but as soon as it takes on the concrete form which it has today and becomes the definitely pursued aim of an organization, it is dangerous.

Not long after he was elected chairman he asked the most active of the directors to meet him at a clubhouse on 60 Street to discuss the policies of the Y.M.H.A. It was at that meeting that Goldwasser and I had quite a tussle as to the Jewish spirit that ought to prevail. I contended that the educational department ought to be conducted by men who are in sympathy with things Jewish whereas the teachers and particularly the principal are assimilationists. Goldwasser, who is himself an assimilationist insisted that the only quality to be taken into consideration in engaging the teachers is their ability to teach. Lehman who did not altogether agree with Goldwasser, would not give in that every activity in the Y.M.H.A. ought to be dominated by the Jewish spirit. He said that Judaism was only one of the means of character development. In contrast with my view that the Jewish social consciousness is the aim and individual character development the means, he considers the Jewish social consciousness as all Jewish Reformers do, only as a means to individual development.

Friday, June 30, 1916

Practically the first time in my life that anything I had to say created something of a stir was when I delivered the address at the graduation exercises of the Seminary and Institute on Sunday, June 11. The "Times" of the Monday following gave the most prominent place to my address in the report it had of the graduation exercises. "Assails Doubters of Jew's Loyalty," Prof. Kaplan calls preaching patriotism to the Jews carrying coals to New Castle." The Jewish press both in Yiddish and English came out with the most laudatory editorials for the courage I displayed in taking issue with Schiff. The fact was that I did not have Schiff principally in mind. It was the general fashion that had become prevalent of late that I wanted to give a deathblow to, and I believe that I have been quite successful. I had very much embittered by the boisterous patriotism of a man like Hyman, who had the impudence to tell his listeners at the dedication exercises of the Central Jewish Institute that we should be Americans in public and Jews in private. Robinson of the Y.M.H.A. told me that whenever any of the out-of-town Y.M.H.A. meetings takes place this is the everlasting theme. I was particularly indignant at the address made by Samuel Strauss in the Educational Alliance at the confirmation exercises which took place on the first day of Shabbath, June 6, in the course of which he made the statement that it was more important to be a good American than to be a good Jew. The only thing I regretted was that some of the opponents of Schiff and the American Jewish Committee took occasion to make use of what I said to attack that crowd.

Last Wednesday, (June 28) I had a conference with Magnes in reference to getting a few additional men on the Special Committee on Teachers Institute of which Greenbaum is chairman. It was a long time since Magnes and I engaged in conversation. Much as I disapprove of his methods I always enjoy talking with him. He and J.H. Cohen are

the only people of all that I know who enable me to realize what a joy conversation can be. I find even a man like Friedlaender quite a bore at times. He never wearies of trying to impress you what a great man he might have been if conditions had been the same as in Germany. Before Magnes and I got down to the business of selecting names, we had an intellectual tussle about the present war-madness which has taken hold of the world. Later on we touched upon the Jewish question -- Benderly had entered the room in the meantime. I was glad to find that Magnes agreed with me that the Bureau of Education had so far confined its activity to detailed improvement and had done nothing to arouse the Jewish public to the urgency of the problem as a whole. I maintained that interest in the problem would not have lagged if we had injected some issue such as the need of rationalizing the religious instruction. This led us to discuss the value of rationalization as such. Magnes at first objected to having the children told that the stories in the book of Genesis are untrue. He launched forth into one of those sentimentalist arguments which are disconcerting by very reason of their absurdity. I asked him what he would have to say if he were asked whether God actually spoke in an ~~xx~~ audible voice to the Israelites at Sinai. The romanticist attitude breaks down entirely when we want to know how far, /for example, we should go in making sacrifices for the observance of the Sabbath. In a question of this kind much depends upon whether or not we believe that the revelation took place as it is described in the Torah.

* * *

Sunday, July 2, 1961¹⁶

In the afternoon of the same day I had a conference with Dr. Paul Klapper, Assistant Professor of Pedagogy in CCNY in reference to pedagogic courses that I should have liked to have him give at the Teachers Institute. I had originally met Klapper in connection with a scheme which Benderly once set on foot but which never materialized. That scheme was to issue licenses to the teachers of the various Talmud

Torah Schools in order to stimulate them to take courses in pedagogy and secular branches of study that might help them to become better teachers. There was a board of examiners of which I was a member together with Klapper and two or three others including Benderly. Klapper is a middle sized man of about 36 or 37, smooth shaven, inclined to be rather stoutish and flabby. He speaks in a soft quiet voice that gives one the impression that he is a good natured fellow. I understood that he is a very popular instructor in the college.

In my conversation with him last ~~Monday~~ Wednesday I tried to learn what was the general attitude of the boys towards Judaism. His answer was that they were as a rule entirely indifferent and apathetic towards it. Even the men who for a time were interested in the work of the Bureau of Education became cold towards it when they realized that there was little ^{chance} ~~change~~ for growth either materially or ideally. I then sounded him as to his own attitude, and he told me frankly that he never misses association for Jewish purposes. He finds, he said, his social instincts fully satisfied in the company of those who have interests similar to his, and he never thinks of visiting the synagogue except on the high holidays. This is the case despite the fact that as a boy he had attended "heder" and had never missed the Sabbath services in the synagogue when a child.

The day before I had the conference with him I was very much depressed in spirit due to the realization that has been growing on me of late that the chances of Judaism surviving in this country are very slim. Time and again it has occurred to me that I ought to join the Ethical Culture movement. I therefore was interested in drawing Klapper out as to the general attitude of the intellectual class towards that movement. He told me that a friend of his who is also on the teaching staff in CCNY and who was at one time an ardent Ethical Culturist has lost interest in the movement. The reason which Klapper gave was that people ~~xxx~~ were not interested in abstract morality, or in abstract

religion. What concerns most people is this or that movement to improve social economic or industrial conditions. Some join Socialism, others the Woman's movement. But abstract goodness appeals to very few as worth while being consciously cultivated by means of assemblies and associations. That point made a deep impression upon me and I believe that I shall have to seek elsewhere than in Ethical Culture for the salvation of my soul if I am to seek it anywhere at all.

An interesting fact that Klapper told me about the school which the Ethical Culturists are conducting is that they seem to be studiously keeping out of it all who are Jews by birth. With the exception of one or two, all the members of the staff are gentiles.

Yesterday I preached to a handful of people at the Long Branch Synagogue. I took as my text the story that Edom refused to let Israel pass through her land on their way to Canaan and that Israel instead of fighting Edom turned aside. I pointed out the parallel between the case of Edom and that of Belgium. We thus have the beginnings of international law, insofar as we find that a people's territory is regarded as inviolable. This is an instance of the collective justice which it has been Israel's function to promulgate. For a time religion regarded as its task to foster individual morality, individual justice. We now realize that individual morality is far too inadequate to bring order into human life. With the advent of great collective undertakings and with the development of the spirit of nationalism a type of justice that will regulate the relations of one nation to another has become indispensable. Judaism has thus the opportunity to come forward with its message of international justice and humanity. Our task as Jews in this country is to help it develop a national conscience, a conscience that will maintain it true to the standards of a justice higher than that which the material interests of this country would dictate.

A case in point is the tense situation which has arisen in our relations to Mexico. While we should not desist from the duty of protecting our citizens, we should not allow ourselves to be carried away by the impulse of the ~~moment~~ moment and declare war without being fully convinced that we were fully justified in going to war.

But I continued how can we ever hope to be an influence for peace when we are ourselves engaged in a bitter industrial struggle, which is even the more to be deprecated because of the victims being for the most part only on one side, the side of the employee's. The manufacturers, nearly all of whom are Jews, have brought discredit upon the Jewish cause by refusing to arbitrate and by flouting public opinion which has been very much aroused by their determination to resort to force instead of to reason as a means of winning in their fight against the laborers. In an announcement which they advertised in the Times last Friday (June 30) they claimed that they considered the right of hiring and discharging employes as inalienable and one therefore which they would not submit to arbitration. I made the point, however, that it was ridiculous to speak nowadays of any right being so inalienable as not to be arbitrable. Noright was absolutely inalienable, not even the right over one's life and body. I gave instances of the right over slaves, the right of property, the rights of parents over children ~~ex~~ how from being absolutely inalienable they came to be modified or altogether abrogated. As Jews it is certainly our duty to submit all our disputes to arbitration - ~~as~~ or as Rabban Gamliel says

* * * *

Tuesday, July 18, 1916

On Sunday, July 9 I attended the meeting of the United Synagogue at the Orthodox Synagogue of Far Rockaway. I went together with my brother-in-law Israeli; on the train we met Profs. Ginzberg, Davidson and Marx. Further than a greeting and a handshake which each of them

gave to my brother-in-laws they said not a word to him. This is illustrative of the interest these scholarly gentlemen take in the men they send out from the seminary and in the Jewish communities with which the graduates are connected.

The meeting was attended by about 35 to 40 people more than half of whom were rabbis. Adler opened the meeting with the announcement of the United Synagogue's incorporation in the State of New York. This he followed with an address in which he spoke of numerous things that ought to be done. Lacking material to describe what was done during the past year, he resorted to the usual device of suggesting what might be done in the coming year.

After luncheon I went over with my brother-in-law Jake to see Joseph H. Cohen who had asked me in the morning to have dinner with him. Again he broached the matter of the West Side Centre. I did not know what to say to him as my mind is greatly perplexed nowadays about the future of Judaism in this country. As time goes on I grow more and more discouraged and if it were not that I have to make a living I would have given up the attempt to do the impossible in helping to perpetuate Judaism in this country when I see clearly the inevitable end that awaits it. I suppose I should be accused of cowardice. I shall not even plead that I am held as in a vise. I am simply one of the myriads of victims of convention who have not the strength of character to break away in time. It is too late now. I shall go through life as though I were condemned to hard labor in Siberia or Sing Sing and try to cheat fate by smiling as hard as I can, though I suppose it will never amount to more than a hypocritical simper. With a frame of mind as this I could not say anything to Cohen.

In the afternoon the discussion dragged on listlessly to be livened up only when one of the delegates broached the congress-conference controversy. Before that I tried to arouse discussion about what I thought the danger the danger lurked in the Kosher Bill. But no one cared.

Despite the fact that Brandeis is now one of the Supreme Judges of the U.S. he did not impress me as having made the appropriate kind of an appeal, particularly if his object was to bring about an understanding between the Congress people and the members of the Astor Conference. But I have my doubts whether that was really his purpose. I have the feeling that the issue between the two groups is one that has to do with the question as to what should be the course adopted by the Jews of this country. Those who favor the Congress are for the most part drawn from the Zionist ranks. What they want, therefore, is to establish here a semi-autonomous Jewish group life. They are using the Congress idea simply as a means of getting the Jews together for that purpose. They want to utilize the predicament of the Jews in Europe as a means of organizing the Jews of America. The conference people on the other hand who are of the better placed class dread nothing more than the furtherance of Jewish group life. Their interest in the Jews of Europe is based on philanthropic principles and they fight bitterly any attempt to convert philanthropic Judaism into national Judaism. This is why the debate during the greater part of the afternoon was waged about the question whether the Congress should be called for the sole purpose of obtaining rights for the Jews everywhere or whether the Congress should become a permanent organization.

Joined of course to this ~~question~~ question of principle is the matter of personal ambition and love of power. Marshall, Adler and Magnes are jealous of the popularity of Brandeis and Stephen ^{Wise} Weiss. The latter again wish to wrest the power from the moneyed interests. With all that the higher interests of the Jewish people would not be compromised by these squabbles -- every people has similar ones -- if we had some terra firma to stand on. The very need our Jews have of some outward calamity to bring them together and the total apathy toward any internal improvement is indication of the final dissolution. The very freedom which will be won for the Jews will help to put an end

to Judaism. Symptomatic of the inner condition of Jewish life are the following remarks made by Phillipson of the Cincinnati College (HUC). "For many years have I dreamt of Jewish unity. But it was only a dream. I find that I could not meet in convention with Zionists, or with Orthodox Jews or with socialists. But now thank God, I have found something that can unite us all, and that is the endeavor to secure equal rights for our brethren." Reduced to simple terms his statement amounts to the fact that he thanks God for seeing to it that the Jews be boycotted, discriminated against and hounded like wild beasts. Otherwise there would be nothing to keep the Jews together.

From the Editorial page of the N.Y. Times, Tuesday, July 18, 1916- Mistaken Zeal

In a rural neighborhood remote from any largely populated centre and lacking in organized means for the extinguishing of conflagrations a body of private citizens who formed themselves into a company of firemen and purchased their own engine and equipment, would be performing a public service of unquestioned value. But if in the city of N.Y. a volunteer fire company on the ancient model, possessing an equipment and officers of its own should try to take part in its own way in the fire fighting the city would stop its activities. We have a fire department thoroughly organized and if citizens are inclined to join it they may do so individually, if they meet the physical requirements and vacancies can be found for them. But, having joined, they must do as they are bid and conform to all the rules of the department. (This was said in reference to the organization of a First Armored Motor Battery that insisted upon being accepted as a whole into the Army.)

The analogy in the above to the futile and therefore mistaken zeal of those of us who seek to foster Jewish life in this country seems to me to be so striking that I cannot help quoting it in order to account for the despair which gnaws at my heart.

Monday, August 14, 1916

Last Tisha b'Ab which began on Monday (Aug 7) night I spoke at the synagogue here in Long Branch. The substance of my address was as follows: In order to comprehend the significance of the day we must allow our vision to extend beyond the narrow circle of our limited lives and embrace within its scope the larger vista of the past and present. I then gave a summary of our past during the first part of which we made history, and during the second part of which we had history made for us. I alluded to the havoc that exists in the belligerent countries. But worst of all is the soul disintegration which is going on among us. I compared our case to that of a child who is smitten by the prevailing epidemic of infantile paralysis. Imagine the grief of the parent when the child survives only as a cripple with some of his limbs paralyzed. We Jews, while we have survived the physical dangers that beset us during the last eighteen centuries, seem to have remain crippled and paralyzed spiritually. Here I described some of the ills that afflict us the wantlessness of our youth, the ineptitude and incapacity of our leaders. I referred particularly to the immigrant rabbis whose influence upon Judaism extends as far as giving a "heksher" on washing powder and biscuits and no further.

I had intended to conclude my address with an appeal for the ~~Relief~~ Relief Fund for the Jewish war sufferers and for the National Fund. But upon consulting Garfunkle the president, I was advised against it. Instead he asked me to use the opportunity for appealing, on behalf of the local Talmud Torah. I acted upon his suggestion and the sum of \$375 was realized right there and then. To me that meant that about 125 people, most of them well-to-do) gave ^{on} Tish b'Ab night \$375 for the continuance of their Jewish social consciousness, about 1/2% of what that same crowd gives for the pleasure of automobilang.

* * *

Tuesday, August 15, 1916

Last Thursday Rabbi Berlin, the organizer of the Mizrachi movement in this country, came to see me. He came avowedly for the purpose of getting me to ask Rabbi Davidowitz who was to preach here last Sabbath, to touch upon the Zionist movement in the course of his address. Berlin remarked that very few of those that are prominent in the orthodox congregations of uptown Jewry know anything about Zionism. He said that he was surprised that men like Friedlaender and myself, whom he knew to be Zionists, did not succeed in inducing the Seminary men to engage ~~xx~~ more actively and aggressively in Zionist propaganda. In reply I admitted that we were somewhat at fault; but what I could not understand was that the Mizrachi movement itself seemed to have forgotten its main purpose, which was to get the observant Jews to take an active part in Zionism and instead to have taken over the work of organizations like the Orthodox Union and similar organizations. It seemed to be interested more in strengthening orthodoxy than in spreading Zionism. What business does the Mizrachi have to organize rabbinical colleges and teachers institutes? He claimed that the present Seminary and Institute were not affording the students a sufficient grounding in their Jewish studies. Why then, I asked, was it necessary to engage in the organization of new institutions before even making the attempt of calling the attention of the authorities of the Seminary to the alleged defect in the curriculum? His answer was that it did not occur to him that this might have been done. It was not the way things of that kind were usually done.

One the whole he impressed me as a man who bent upon eking out a livelihood and compelled to reckon with the difficulties due to his having practically been cast upon these shores by circumstances due to the present war in Europe, he is trying to create a clientele for himself upon whom he could live. If I were to admit that the existing institutions are the ones that are best fitted to meet the problem what

Tuesday, August 15, 1916

Last Thursday Rabbi Berlin, the organizer of the Mizrachi movement in this country, came to seeme. He came avowedly for the purpose of getting me to ask Rabbi Davidowitz who was to preach here last Sabbath, to touch upon the Zionist movement in the course of his address. Berlin remarked that very few of those that are prominent in the orthodox congregations of uptown Jewry know anything about Zionism. He said that he was surprised that men like Friedlaender and myself, whom he knew to be Zionists, did not succeed in inducing the Seminary men to engage ~~in~~ more actively and aggressively in Zionist propaganda. In reply I admitted that we were somewhat at fault; but what I could not understand was that the Mizrachi movement itself seemed to have forgotten its main purpose, which was to get the observant Jews to take an active part in Zionism and instead to have taken over the work of organizations like the Orthodox Union and similar organizations. It seemed to be interested more in strengthening orthodoxy than in spreading Zionism. What business does the Mizrachi have to organize rabbinical colleges and teachers institutes? He claimed that the present Seminary and Institute were not affording the students a sufficient grounding in their Jewish studies. Why then, I asked, was it necessary to engage in the organization of new institutions before even making the attempt of calling the attention of the authorities of the Seminary to the alleged defect in the curriculum? His answer was that it did not occur to him that this might have been done. It was not the way things of that kind were usually done.

One the whole he impressed me as a man who bent upon eking out a livelihood and compelled to reckon with the difficulties due to his having practically been cast upon these shores by circumstances due to the present war in Europe, he is trying to create a clientele for himself upon whom he could live. If I were to admit that the existing institutions are the ones that are best fitted to meet the problem what

would there remain for him to do? He may be sincere, but his sincerity is, after all, only a commercial commodity. As an illustration of what it amounts to may be taken the fact that after putting me to the trouble of asking Davidowitz to speak on behalf of Zionism, he himself stayed away from the services and worshipped with what might be called the Jewish Black Hundred type who have condemned the synagogue because they do not consider the present arrangement in the seating of the sexes in keeping with the law.

* * * *

Thursday, August 17, ~~1961~~ 1916

Last Sabbath I had occasion to be at Far Rockaway. Lichter ~~ho~~ is the rabbi of the new synagogue there invit d me to occupy the pulpit. My subject was "Preparing a Way for God." (~~1916~~) Following is the substance of my address: That God's coming should depend upon man building a road for him is quite at variance with the notion that we usually entertain. The picture in the Song of Songs ~~1916~~ as applied to God is more in accord with the prevalent conception of God's coming. The coming of God denotes the conquest of mind and matter, the irrefutable demonstration of the reality of the spiritual, the ultimate establishment of purity and peace. We generally delude ourselves with the belief that all this will be achieved if we will only hold fast to the ideal. It never occurs to us to give careful thought to the means and material whereby the ideal is to be attained. Our ideas as to the spiritual are confined to the realm of the idyllic, the romantic and the Utopian. We shall make little progress however if we do not adopt in the spiritual domain the same naturalistic, realistic, inductive and experimental attitude which has proved so fruitful in the domain of the material interests. In place of the aircastle building which we usually construct from the top downwards instead of from the foundation upwards, we have to introduce efficient engineering. Road building for God is but another name for practical idealism.

(fill in Hebrew at top of page 242)

Ignoring the need of roadbuilding for God must lead to the most heartbreaking disillusionment. The experience of the Jews upon their return from Babylon are illustrative of the disappointment that all who expect God to come "leaping over the mountains" must suffer.

We deplore the breakdown of religion as shown by its inability to prevent man from turning into a brute and waging ruthless war. We forget, however, that merely dangling the vision of peace before men's eyes could never bring peace nearer realization. We have ministries of war, but we have no ministries of peace.

The same is true of education. We say that we aim at developing character in the child. But that is as far as we go. We never analyze the instincts and the impulses of the child. Our knowledge of the psychic elements that ^{go} to make up personality is crude and vague.

And how about Jewish life? Further than a hazy conception of the rehabilitation of Israel we have not made the least effort at roadbuilding. The Jews of the occident have come to believe that the salvation of Israel will be achieved if the Jews will be granted civil and political rights. The Jews of Eastern Europe who still live in mediavalism believe that the salvation of Israel will be achieved by stubbornly and blindly resisting the spirit of modernism. (I then read specimens of the report of the Cracow convention which took place in 1903, showing the obscurantist attitude that still prevails in Jewry.) The same is true of Zionism and Jewish education. We believe in the restoration of the Jews to Zion but we never think of Zionist activity as a religious Jewish duty. We believe in Talmud Torah yet we consider the attempt to introduce proper organization and administration as foreign to the spirit of Jewish education. (At this point I made direct allusion to Dr. Benderly whom I described as the greatest engineer of Jewish life that we have.)

Wednesday, August 23, 1916

Last Sabbath Dr. Theodore Hurwitz and Dr. Keller came to see me. The former is on the staff of the Yeshibath Elchanan. He is the son of an old type rabbi. He received a regular college and University training. He was a student at the Seminary for one year, but for some reason or other discontinued attendance. At the time I thought that it was due to radical views that he might have adopted. In fact, from what I recall, he impressed me as being inclined towards radicalism. Later on, however, I found him among the ranks of the orthodox. He got his Ph.D. degree from Gottheil, which as a rule does not mean much, but being a studious fellow he may have picked up a good bit of the regular jargon of Jewish science. He is rather short in stature; his face is rather pleasing in appearance and has a small french beard. He seems to be of a rather nervous disposition because he fidgets when he talks. The other man is a physician. He was a Yeshiba-babur in Russia and came to this country as a young man of little less than twenty. He also attended the Seminary for a while - when it was still in 736 Lexington Avenue and Drachman and Jaffe constituted the entire staff - but he soon changed for medicine. He is one of the few physicians in the city who lead Jewish lives in the sense that they really care to be Jews and to conform to traditional Jewish practice. I can name but two or three others; they are Dr. Samuel Friedman and his nephew Dr. Friedman and a Dr. Illoway. Dr. Keller takes an active part in Jewish institutions, and is frequently invited to young men's meetings as a representative or ~~xxxx~~ orthodox Judaism. He is of average height, blonde in appearance, wears glasses and has a small beard.

Neither he nor Dr. Hurwitz impress one as being of consequence. There is certain mushiness about their manner that seems to be a natural consequence of the type of Judaism of which they have chosen to be protagonists. Knowing that my views are both more radical and aggressive Hurwitz gave me a wide berth whenever there was the likelihood of a

discussion about Judaism arising. What led both him and Keller to come to see me was the following: About two weeks ago I received a letter from Hurwitz apprising me of the formation of a society for the advancement of traditional Judaism. The society, he said, was to consist of men who had a claim to scholarship and who were strict Jewish conformists. Orthodoxy was a sine qua non of membership. I did not know what reply to give him, when I received that letter asking me to join the society. On the one hand I was really anxious to join a group of intellectual Jews who were interested in furthering Judaism. On the other hand, I was reluctant to join a group that was committed to orthodoxy. He had written that men like Revel, a Dr. Macht from Baltimore and other men of that type were to belong to it. I had a peculiar experience with Macht. I have never met the man. Several years ago, about two years after I had begun teaching in the Seminary, I received a letter from him asking me whether it was true that I taught that the Ten Commandments were not of divine origin. I do not recall exactly what I answered him, but I remember that I carried out the principle. I therefore asked Hurwitz to come and acquaint me more accurately with the nature of the society of which he wanted me to become a member.

The discussion which ensued was to me rather illuminating. It showed me that their orthodoxy was rather hollow. They used that term to describe their attitude towards Judaism not because they subscribed to every one of the traditional tenets or even to the most important ones but because they adhered to the Shulchan Aruh. Even as to that one could easily puncture their theology, because they do not as a matter of fact keep up the observances as laid down in the Shulchan Aruh, for what civilized man today can do that? After I was through with them I realized even more clearly that we are now afflicted by a new ~~breed~~ brood nameely fanatics with a doubt, a class of people that furnish us with a sort of caricature of the "Will to Believe."

Thursday, August 24, 1916

Last Sunday I went to Far Rockaway on what I consider to have been a fool's errand. Cohen had asked me to come expecting that there would be a meeting of the Plan & Scope Committee of the West Side Centre. No such meeting was held and I spent the day uselessly, although I found the conversation with him quite interesting. He is to me the most stimulating person in my circle of acquaintances.

This week I have been giving a series of three lectures on "How to Teach the Ceramones." I am giving the series to a group of teachers of the Bureau Schools.

On one of my return trips this week I fell in with Dr. Bernard Revel, the present head of the Yeshiba. Although he has been living in N.Y. in the same house with me we have never visited each other. I avoided him because I had been warned that he is not altogether trustworthy. Although I could have avoided him this time too, I did not do so. We had a very interesting conversation. He maintained that Judaism emphasized this worldliness as opposed to the other worldliness and soul saving tendency of Christianity. I took issue with him on that score because I believe that we cannot attribute to Judaism any particular philosophy of life. He spoke very intelligently and used a remarkably good English, although he stammered once in a while. This particularly surprised me in a man who on the one hand possesses a reputation for Jewish learning of the kind one meets with only in Eastern Europe and on the other hand is quite familiar with the literature of Jewish Science. As we parted he said "This has been a revelation to me; I hope there will no more be any misunderstanding between us."

On Wednesday (Aug. 23) I attended the meeting to which were invited the members of the West Side Centre. Only eight turned up. It was conducted very informally while luncheon was being served. The meeting took place at Hotel McAlpin on W. 34 Street. I was informed by Cohen that I was henceforth to act as chairman of the Plan and Scope

Committee. I asked to be authorized to negotiate with the man whom I consider eligible for the position of principal and social director. I had in mind Raphael H. Melamed of Philadelphia.

I had written to Melamed to come to see me today. He saw me at the Institute at 3:30. He informed me that he had recently accepted the position of instructor at Gratz College and principal of the Religious school connected with it. He promised to take under consideration the proposition I made to him.

* * *

Saturday night, August 26, 1916

I spoke today at the Long Branch Synagogue. My subject was Tolerance. Text from Hap Torah . I began by pointing out the significance of the opening words as summing up the story of our people. But the prophet seems to assure us that each of these evils will be removed by God. In place of poverty in place of . The promise is the counterpart of which denotes Israel perturbed and agitated for lack of peace.

No word falls so frequently from our lips when we pray as the word He. It is the stock in trade of the preachers. Yet it meets with no reaction. The thing to do is to restamp it in the mint of thought. It will come to mean a great deal more if we will substitute in each case the term tolerance. The advantage of this term over that of peace is that it suggests the mental attitude that we have to adopt if we wish to secure peace.

I then spoke of tolerance in our domestic relationships. I spoke of tolerance in American life, and pointed out the paradox of the Catholics who met in convention this week and who asked for liberty of conscience at the same time that they denounced the "alien radicalism" of the universities and characterized Kant, Tolstoy and similar thinkers as a monstrous brood. America is developing of late a spirit

of intolerance. It is becoming like Sodom which had the cot into which every stranger was laid.

I then took up the case of intolerance as it exists among us. We have shown no tendency towards tolerance of a constructive character. Every insignificant peculiarity is made the occasion for a schism. I gave the analogy of two people who are in a room. One finds the air too close and wants to have the window open and the other is afraid of a draft. I criticized the action of a ^{member} ~~member~~ of the ultras who claimed that the synagogue was not kosher enough for them because the women are not completely shut out from view. I maintained that those who found the present construction of the synagogue objectionable are entitled to their opinion. But withal that it did not constitute enough ground for them to break away. The responsibility in all such case is great because it is liable to obscure from view the reality of God and to undermine the wellbeing of Israel.

The sermon was well received. Dr. Keller who accosted me after the service told me that the real reason some of the people I criticized worshipped in the casion of one of the hotels instead of at the synagogue was that they were not given the use of the pulpit in the synagogue. I was glad, however, that Rabbi Berlin, one of the offenders in this regard, came this time as he said, to hear me speak. He brought along with him Rabbi Abramowitz who is to be sent to Europe as the representative of the Central Relief Committee, the "kosher" committee which has Fischel for its treasurer.

* * *

Sunday, August 27, 1916

At the synagogue yesterday morning there was a young man of about 32 by the name of Rabbi Fleischer. I had heard of him before as possessing extraordinary knowledge of the Talmud, but as unable to adjust himself to society. When I saw him yesterday he appeared ef

of medium height, slim and wearing a cutaway coat. His complexion blonde with a small reddish beard to offset a very intelligent looking face and rather well shaped nose. I learned more about him when he came to us after a while and we invited him to dinner. As soon as I met him face to face I realized that here was a man who possessed an extraordinary fund of Jewish knowledge comparable ^{with} and even superior to that possessed by those who enjoy world reputations and yet all the use that he seemed to be to the world was represented by the seven dollars a week which a congregation in Brownsville paid him for being their rabbi and preaching to them three or four times a week. As ? they added faultfinding and bickerings. I was cudgelling my brain all that day how to ameliorate his lot, but there was nothing I could think of. I told him to come to the synagogue at the time set for Minha; I might then induce Garfunkel to allow him to preach. This might bring him in a few dollars. But as becomes a man of this type he came too late. Next day about forty-five were collected for him by father.

* * * * *

Tuesday, August 29, 1916

Another members' meeting of the West Side Jewish Centre took place on Sunday at Long Beach, L.I. at five in the afternoon. Although I had been unwilling to come, I was strongly urged to do so by Cohen and Fishman. There were a few more persons at this meeting than at the preceding one. So far the progress is rather slow, and the money does not seem to be forthcoming. As a proposition that involves more than a quarter of a million, it would seem that there ought to have been more willingness to contribute. The chief matter considered was membership propaganda.

Yesterday I had a conference with Miss Hajnalka Langer. She is a graduate of the Teachers Institute and has become one of the chief workers in the Bureau of Education. Her interest at present is centered upon Jewish home making. I intend to have her begin that work with the

women of the W.S. Centre as soon after the holidays as possible. She is a personabæ young lady of about twenty-five, a college graduate and an excellent teacher. She does not have a profound mind but she possesses a gift for details and executive ability.

Today I went with my brother-in-law Edward Rubin to take a look at his silk mill in Paterson. The hyde of materialistic ambition is not completely doxmed in me. It asserted itself last Friday night when I had a talk with him. I dreamed once again of turning to the practical affairs of life, and when he suggested that I go to take a look at the mill, I gladly consented to do so. When I rode with him and his son Milton in the train this morning I had them both explain to me the business situation as it concerned him, and the details involved in the manufacture of silk. At one moment it appeared to me as an enchanting Romance at the other as a sordid aimless pursuit. This latter conviction gained on me when Milton took me to Paterson while his father remained in New York. From my conversation with him it was borne in upon me that Ed with all his wealth gets very little out of life that is worthwhile. He is not evey laying the foundation of future happiness. He is squandering all his energies in money getting without the prospect of ever really enjoying what he will have amassed. When I came to the mill I was sorely disappointed. I had expected to see a sanitary well managed factory. What I saw impressed me as noisy, unsafe and unsanitary, with disorder and waste quite rampant. As I returned my heart was very much saddened at the hard pitiless grind of the average well-to-do Jewish business man, whose life is ill-organized empty and futile. In addition they have as wives women who have not the least conception of their husband's toil, whose greatest problem is that of getting upstairs girls and nurses, and who grow stout and nuraasthenic for want of anything worthwhile to occupy their minds with.

Sunday, September 3, 1916

Yesterday I walked to ? to hear President Wilson deliver his speech of acceptance of the nomination for re-election. I experienced some of that awe which was meant to be voiced in the blessing

p-15 I could not help thinking of the contrast between the Jewish people moribund and spiritless and the American people in the prime vigor of youth. How happy the lot of those that lead the one; how wretched the lot of those doomed to stand by the deathbed of the other.

* * *

Saturday night, September 23, 1916

I enjoy my stay in Long Beach whenever I recall how essential it is to the health and well being of my family to spend the summer out-of-town. ~~Here~~ Occasionally I also regale in the outdoor air and sunshine when I sit and work or read quietly on the porch. Most of the time, however, I experience here all the solitude and isolation of a prison. The days and the weeks are passing by without my achieving anything. When I am in New York I have at least occasion to interchange a word with somebody. Here I am all alone; not a human being who is interested in or troubled by problems similar to mine. But the less said the better.

The last few weeks I have had an interchange of letters with Adler and Marshall about the finances of the Institute. I have gotten to a point where I realize the futility of all my moanings about the hopelessness of the task in life to which I am tied down. I am simply resigned.

This morning I preached at the Long Branch Synagogue. There were but few people present but I was impelled to speak by a desire to redeem myself for a previous sermon that I had foisted on the same audience two weeks ago. I then forgot that I had before me a congregation that possessed but little intellectual background and I attempted to explain to them the significance of the personification of Israel. I could see that the thing fell flat. Today I tried to come down to

to their intellectual level. Taking as my text ^{a)} I proceeded to prove that leading a worthy life/is perfectly natural (). We palliate our mean and selfish lives by saying that it is natural. We call one that is good "angelic" as though only angels could be good. We claim that business demands occasional disregard of ethical laws, etc.; b) within our reach (). We complain that we have not the means to be kind and generous, we have not the time to give to our children or to some public cause. This is untrue, because every one has it in his power to live in accord with the promptings of the higher life ; c) and never too late to begin anew. The claim that life long habit has rendered living a worthy life unnatural is offset by the fact that we are not expected to change overnight. The life spiritual also admits of the installment plan .

* * *

Monday, September 25, 1916

While I was to synagogue this morning it occurred to me as I noticed the paid "minyan" men, or as they are oftendesignated "the minionaires" that we, the so-called spiritual leaders, the rabbis, educators, social workers, etc., are the paid minyan men of the Jewish people.

* * * *

Saturday night, September 30, 1916

We stayed in Long Branch over Rosh Hashanah (which was on Thursday and Friday) on account of the epidemic of infantile paralysis in N.Y. Parents were with us and we spent quite a pleasant holiday. I preached both days. The audience consisted of about 125. In all I preached about eight times during my stay out here this summer. They asked me again to preach today, but I balked this time, though I was very much tempted to accept the invitation. I somehow or other felt that my speaking today would be superfluous. It really makes very

difference whether I did speak or I didn't; but this time I wanted that the unimportance should be on the side of not speaking.

Last night Ed. Kaufman a member and former president of the Orach Chayim Synagogue and a director of the Central Institute of 85 St. told me that I should have accepted the position as head of the Central Institute. Isaac Cohen was present when Kaufman said this to me, and he explained to me later on that Goldstein had shown Kaufman a letter from a Brooklyn congregation inviting him to become their rabbi. Kaufman told Goldstein by all means to accept that position. It seems, therefore, that Kaufman is anxious to have me take charge of the Central Institute. I told Cohen that the only condition on which I would consider taking the position after Goldstein would give it up is that the Institute change its form of organization from a philanthropic into a congregational institution. I even suggested the possibility of my taking charge of both the Central Institute and of the West Side Centre. All this however is pure speculation on both Cohen's part and mine.

* * *

Monday, January 1, 1917

The Jewish Centre movement has made considerable progress the last few months. The first meeting in which I participated as a member of the organization took place on Tuesday, Oct. 10 at Hotel McAlpin. There were about seventeen present. The impression it left on me was grating. The vulgarity displayed by a Mr. Moskowitz - a mountain of flesh and fat - as he sat in his shirt sleeves made me feel very uncomfortable for the future of the movement, particularly when I learned that he was the chairman of the membership committee. It was at that meeting that I made the suggestion to give the women the same right of suffrage as the men. The suggestion was favorably received by every one. Cohen then made the suggestion that a family gathering be held for the purpose of arousing those already affiliated to more energetic labors and adding new members. From that time on ~~the~~ meeting after

meeting took place in preparation of the Family Gathering which was held at the Astor on Sunday, Nov. 12. My duty consisted of drawing up a souvenir booklet setting forth the principles underlying the Jewish Centre and delivering the principal address of the occasion. Both things were successful. So far about sixteen new members have been added, and very elaborate building plans have been drawn up. The realization, however, is still far away.

My ~~xxx~~ class at Teachers College this year is not very large--there are seven in all, five women and two men--but they are students who never had done any work under me before, while last year the larger number were recruited from students of the Institute. I am giving the course this year in far more elementary fashion than last year, and the students seem to find the work interesting.

I am giving the same course at the Seminary, though it naturally demands adaptation to the particular needs of the Seminary men.

* * * *

Saturday night, January 6, 1917

On Friday, Nov. 10 the Y.M.H.A. and Kindred Assn. began holding its annual convention. I was invited by Mrs. Unterberg to the dinner which was given to some of the delegates in the Y.W.H.A. building and to some of the "swells" who are interested in social work. ~~The~~
~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ We were all given black paper caps, one of the latest inventions of modern orthodoxy -- and I was asked to make kiddush. It is understood of course that I had my Shabbos meal at home before I went there, because I never enjoy these state occasions particularly if my mind has to be at work upon some speech that I am expected to make subsequently. In this particular case I was scheduled to deliver the sermon at the services which were to take place after

we were through with dinner. I missed most of the dinner guests at the services. They weren't even led by curiosity to be present at the services because they probably had to go to theater or to some affair that had more interest for them than religious services.

The next day I took part in the conference on the religious work of the Y.M.H. A. and kindred associations. The conference took place at the Jewish Central Institute. Some of the delegates little realizing the impropriety of taking notes on the Sabbath in orthodox surroundings had to be deliberately told to stop writing. I harped upon my old theme that the associations must be more Jewish in spirit and that to be so they must resort to ^{other} ~~the~~ means than holding Friday night services or conducting Sunday School classes for little children. On the whole these conferences and gatherings impress me more as a sort of advertising scheme for Goldwasser and his collaborators. I am simply made use of to ^{drum} ~~drum~~ up trade, as it were. Perhaps in course of time I may succeed in making some dent. My constant hammering upon the need of having our social institutions more Jewish may ultimately have some effect.

On Saturday night, Nov. 11 I was visited by Dr. S. Friedman and a Mr. Kongsberg. Friedman is known to many as Shabbos Friedman because he does not take money from his patients on the Sabbath, though I have been told that he does not object if the patient throws the money into his pocket. I am nevertheless inclined to credit him with strict observance of the rites and ceremonies and with sincere orthodox convictions, because he has brought up his children according to strict orthodox principles and has had them taught a considerable amount of Jewish subject matter. He himself knows some Talmud and is very fond of pilpulistic lore. He attends the minyan of the Hasidim instead of the regular synagogues. His nephew Elisha Friedman has often complained about him to me as being an unbearable fanatic.

The other man Konigsberg, is a lawyer who is no less of a fanatic than Friedman, except that in his case the fanaticism is not even redeemed by the possession of personality or knowledge. He is a director of the Down Town Talmud Torah. The mother of one of the children of that school raised a howl that her child was being taught false doctrines. The teacher happened to be one that had been recommended by the Bureau and who had been a pupil of the Institute. Roused by this charge he tried to raise an uproar against Benderly and myself but was held down by the other directors. But he was not to be quieted down altogether and he told Dr. Friedman, who is his uncle, about what he considered my heretical teachings, and they came together to ask me to disavow any such teachings as had been attributed to me. Instead of giving them a straightforward answer I wagged my tongue quite diplomatically and continued to be non-committal during nearly two hours, at the end of which time I promised to meet them again to talk over the entire matter at greater length. Instead, however, of keeping my promise, I wrote them that it would be useless to enter into a lengthy discussion and that I considered best for them to visit the classes themselves, if they cared to, and convince themselves that our work was conducted in a most intensely Jewish spirit. They realized, I suppose, that I was simply evading the issue, and I have not heard from them since.

* * * *

Tuesday, January 30, 1917

My beloved Father SV died on Thursday night,
the third of Shebat, 5677 (Jan. 25, 1917) at 10:15 P.M. (1848)

His biography is brief. He was born sixty-nine years ago -- so at least I gathered from various remarks made by him now and then, for he never stated to me his age -- in the little town of Slieleli(?) Russia. He was the second of five children, three brothers and two sisters. At the age of twelve he was sent to study in Wilna and there

while quite young he received S'micha from R. Bzalel. He married my mother at Swenjiave to which town R. ^(Reines?) Reeves was called not long after. He also received S'micha from R. Reeves. After having spent a year or so in Swenjiave, father studied in Dunaburg (now Dwinsk). Volozhin and Kovno, Shavel and Asheshor.

Thursday, February 1, 1917

At Kovno he received S'micha from R. Isaac Elchanan. He was recognized as a Harif though he never resorted to pilpulistic casuistry. He was noted for his sound reasoning. When he came back from Kovno he was urged to accept a rabbinate and R. Reeves went with him to induct him into office in one of the towns near Vilna. When he got there he was displeased with the class of people that came to the synagogue and refused to be their rabbi. After that he went again to study, this time to Rishen, the Yeshiba of which was presided over by R. Sender Moshe of whom father spoke frequently as remarkable both for his learning and strength of character. In most of these Yeshibas father enjoyed privileges not accorded to other students. He was permitted to read something of modern Hebrew literature and journalism, such was the faith reposed in his adherence to the traditional habits and beliefs.

In all these years of his study mother maintained herself by keeping a small grocery store that was patronized by Polish inhabitants of the town. The earnings were very small but even these were growing less as the Poles began to open up their own little stores. It seems that the boycott of which we hear so much nowadays began already at that time, that is during the eighties. It thus became more and more imperative for father to earn a livelihood. An opening presented itself when the position of Rosh Yeshiba in Taurigen became vacant. He was recommended by R. Isaac Elchanan and others. When he came there and delivered his inaugural lecture he made a very excellent impression and the people escorted him back to his house with music. But he took sick; he suffered, it seems, from some kind of lung trouble and after

twelve weeks he had to give up the position and to go to Konigsberg to be cured.

My recollection of father during those years is limited to that of the hustle and bustle in the house when he was expected to return from the different Yeshibahs wither he had gone to study. I remember his having brought me a ~~whistle~~ whistle -- that was when I was probably about four, and later on when I had begun to go to Heder he brought me a small set of Humesh of which I was very proud; I begrudged any other boy looking into it together with me while we studied in Heder. I remember also father's taking me once to the synagogue on a holiday and the impression made on me by the Rabbi in his silk hat, which I then saw for the first time. Outside of these few incidents, I do not recall anything that a child might expect from his father under normal circumstances.

When father returned from Konigsburg affairs at home took a turn for the worse and poverty began to threaten. It was decided that father should go to America. (I recall having heard from mother that father had made an attempt to go to America one or two years before he actually left Russia, but got only as far as Hamburg. The accompanying letter of introduction from Samuel Joseph Fin to Alexander Kohut belongs to that first attempt.) -- that is to New York -- where one of my mother's brothers, Mendel Kruzansky, had lived for about three years, and to find there some source of a livelihood. In the meantime mother together with my sister and myself were to go to Paris when two of my mothers brothers, Joseph and Jonas Kruzansky had established themselves. This was in July, 1888. I was then seven years old. As soon as father came here he was taken into the house of the Chief Rabbi Jacob Joseph. He was given food and lodging and some pocket money for services he rendered in the way of deciding upon ritual questions and entertaining scholarly ~~visitors~~ visitors with discussions on Talmudic lore. Mother, Sophie and myself came from Paris where we had been in sore straits

on July 16, 1889.

It was not long before father broke with R. Joseph and ~~his~~ his entourage on account of their unscrupulous methods in trying to get control of the kosher meat trade and of the resources which that trade might have yielded for communal purposes. A number of butchers seceded from the organization and appointed father as supervisor of the kashruth in their shops. Each one of these butchers put out a sign in the window of his store which read After a year or so the group that recognized him as supervisor became disorganized. After a great deal of struggling he obtained the post of supervisor in a slaughterhouse which yielded him ten dollars a week. Later he was given charge of the kashruth of an additional slaughterhouse. Altogether he earned fifteen dollars a week.

He spent his mornings during the last two decades of his life in attending to his supervision work. Afternoons he would usually take his nap. The rest of the time he would spend in studying Talmud and Poskim. He was weak and unfit for strenuous or persistent labor of any kind. In his luminous hours he was capable of deep insight into the various problems of human life. He had a ^{poor ear} ~~poor ear~~ for language and was never able to acquire the vernacular of this country. He read the Yiddish papers for general news. During the last nine years we conversed in Hebrew. In the beginning I gained considerable fluency in Hebrew in this way. I enjoyed particularly telling him the substance of some of my sermons or addresses. In former years -- that is about eight to twelve years ago -- his suggestions were very helpful at times. During the last few years, however, there existed very little of an intellectual character that was in common between us. As I would go up daily to see my parents I would find very little to talk about except the petty trifles ~~of~~ that concerned my own person -- matters that I detest to talk about except as they are drawn out from me. I viewed the widening gap between father and myself as a tragedy and I tried

last year to close it up by studying Talmud with him. I have no intrinsic interest in the Talmud because its contents are for the most part of no relevance whatever to the problems and needs of Jewish life. But, unfortunately, it is expected of me and generally supposed that I have a good command of Talmud. It is in order to live up to this opinion that I take up the study of it time and again. As I knew that nothing could please parents more than if I would study with father, I used to come to their house evenings quite regularly at about 10:30 and study the treatise of Gittin for about ~~and~~ an hour and a half each time. We stopped when he took sick ~~and~~ with broncho-pneumonia last April. Ever since then he has been very weak and was finally overtaken about two weeks ago by the illness that ended his life. On his death bed he would quote some passage from the Talmud for many of the incidents of the attendance upon him. In a spell of semi-delirium which he had two nights before he died he recited passages from the Talmud in his usual sing-song chant. Realizing that there was no hope of his recovery he said the Shma and Vidui the night before. He passed away Thursday night at 10:15.

Today I rose from "Shiba." I must say that my attitude toward its observance has changed. Whereas from the theoretical standpoint I had regarded the ceremonious visitations and the compulsory abstention from labor as a boring and burdensome experience now that I have had to go through it myself, I have come to look upon it as a useful and humanizing institution. The stream of people coming and going prevents futile brooding and the compulsory abstention from labor makes it impossible for the dead to pass out of mind with almost tragic swiftness. I felt as if the days of mourning with the visits of all kinds of people and the daily services had socialized me more Jewishly, had knit me closer to the body of Jewish life and traditions. It is such feeling that I always identify as Jewishness or Judaism.

To pick up the thread dropped before recording father's ~~death~~ death -- On Sunday, Nov. 26, 11 A.M. I spoke at the Wⁱⁿdleigh High School under the auspices of a Harlem group of Zionists headed by a Dr. Keller. I have known this man in a general way for a number of years, but I have yet failed to fathom his makeup. He is a physician who at one time had other aspirations than being a physician. He seems to have studied in some Yeshiba before he came to this country about twenty years ago. Upon his arrival here he attended the Seminary for awhile, but finally took to medicine. I cannot imagine that he is making much of a success at medicine since he devotes so much time to zionistic and general Jewish work. In line with his Jewish activities he organized a Jewish Forum.

Friday, February 2, 1917

My subject was "The Essence of Judaism." The audience was ~~small~~ but seemed on the whole quite intelligent.

On Sunday Dec. 15 I went to Boston to participate in the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the erection of the Adath Jeshurun Synagogue where my brother-in-law Dr. Israeli officiates as rabbi. I do not know what object the congregation had in celebrating the tenth anniversary. Probably its president N. Pinanski was interested in putting his candidacy as president ~~at~~ to the fore. I can hardly believe that he is interested in congregational matters or is anxious to hold office because of the spiritual pleasure that it yields him. From various remarks made by him to me as well from my general impression of the man, I gather that his connection with the congregation gives him considerable prestige with the city politicians from whom he seeks favors for himself or for his son. He is a medium built man, heavy set, bulldog neck and chin, black mustache, vulgar and loud in his bearing, a Jewish edition of a Tammany Hall politician. I would

hardly have had anything to do with the man if it were not for my brother-in-law whose incumbency as rabbi is dependent upon his good will.

The celebration opened with the regular Friday evening service at sundown. The synagogue had been decorated with bunting in which the Zion flag was included. A special choir had been trained for the purpose and there was a speech in Yiddish by a Rabbi Yudelewitz between
and . Though this rabbi was introduced in the most laudatory terms by Israeli, he did not say a word in commendation of Israeli's achievements in the synagogue, which are remarkable considering the obstacles and discouragements that he has had to overcome. Besides this rabbi being an acquaintance of our family and a former colleague of father's in ~~the~~ his youthful study circles, He should have said a few words of encouragement which would have strengthened Israeli's position with the old timers who constantly interfere with his work. I told Yudelwitz after he was through that I could not congratulate him upon his effort for this unpardonable omission.

At the second evening service arranged by the Junior Congregation of young men and women + was greeted by about four to five hundred people despite the heavy snow storm that raged at the time. In the introductory remarks of felicitation I pointed out that in a transition age such as ours only the quality of humility can enable a leader to achieve his purpose, as was the case with Moses who would not have been able to be a leader to the generation of the Wilderness if he had not been the humblest of men. I then proceeded with a description of what the ideal synagogue should be, repeating practically my address of Nov. 12 given at the banquet of the Jewish Center.

The next morning the special exercises for the celebration consisted of a recitation and a speech in Hebrew by the best boy and the best girl of the school. I was very much moved by the Jewish fervor with which they spoke. They were followed by R. Konowitz of Elizabeth, N.J. who spoke in Yiddish. In contrast with the pilpulistic artificiali-

ties of Yudelewitz he spoke in a clear and forceful manner upon the text of the week's Sidrah. He drew a parallel between Joseph and the growing generation. As the former was believed to have been ~~harrax~~ torn by wild beast but turned out to be not only live but righteous and prosperous so the young generation that is often believed to be spiritually destroyed turns out to be thriving and Jewish in spirit. He knew very well how to hand out compliments to the congregation and the officials and I was very much pleased to hear him say a few words of commendation of my brother-in-law.

During the reading of the ^{up}Torah I went downstairs where the boys were conducting their own services. Israeli had organized them into a children's congregation to conduct their own services because ^{few}very/of the fathers who come to synagogue could induce their children to come with them and even if they did the children considered such attendance a burden which they were only too glad to escape. It is with a different spirit however that these children now enter into their own services. They have their own officials and hazan, and recite their prayers with more devotion and decorum than their parents in the main synagogue. Nevertheless, I found seated at the back of the room where the children's services were going on, a number of old fogies who kept on conversing among themselves, and about whom I was told that they strenuously objected to these children's services. When I was there about one hundred children were present.

In the afternoon I listened to a lengthy discourse by the same R. Konowitz. He impressed me as a very good speaker. I enjoyed particularly those passages of his which he intoned with a wailing chant. I admit that our occidental way of speaking is at its best but cold and unemotional when compared with these outbursts of eloquence in a sad plaintive sing-song which calls forth tears from those who are familiar with the ghetto life and spirit.

Sunday, February 4, 1917

I spoke at the Y.M.H.A. services on Friday night, December 22. Taking the Hanuka light as symbolic of the Jewish soul, I dwelt upon the three distinguishing characteristics of the soul, self-knowledge, self-respect and self-help. In speaking of the last I urged that they organize for the relief of the Jews in the war zone.

On Tuesday December 26 I left for the Menorah Convention which was taking place at the Minnesota University, Minneapolis. I had been invited to lead a forum on the question "What is Judaism?" in view of the interest aroused by the series of five articles. I had contributed to the Menorah Journal last year.

Never having traveled by myself before over so long a distance folks saw to it that I should be made as comfortable as possible. As I stepped off the train at Chicago I was met by a Mr. Black, a salesman for the firm of Rubin Bros., my brother-in-law. He had been asked by Max to meet me. He was together with a man by the name of Sachs from Philadelphia. They both took me to a nearby hotel where I had sardines and coffee, my mainstay in trefa-land. After the meal they saw me off to the train for Minneapolis. When I arrived there at eight o'clock I telephoned to Rabbi Matt, a former pupil of mine at the Seminary to find out where the Menorah men were stopping. His wife answered that he was still at the morning service in his synagogue, a fact which surprised me very much, as I could hardly believe that in the western cities enough people could be gotten together to form a minyan on a week-day. I refer of course to communities presided over by the graduates of the Seminary.

On learning that Henry Hurwitz, the Chancellor of the Menorah and others were located at Hotel Radisson, I went there, and soon was at breakfast with Hurwitz, Louis I. Newman and a Rev. Sandheim from Winnipeg who had also come as a delegate. Hurwitz is one of the first or-

ganizer of Menorah societies in the various colleges and universities of the country and chief editor of the Menorah Journal. I formed his acquaintance about six years ago when he invited me to address the Hebraic Society of Boston. My subject at that time was Jewish Education, I pointed out the significance of the establishment of the Bureau of Education for Jewish education in this country. Ever since then he has been inviting me to address and write for the Menorahs. He is a short cleancut little man of about thirty one. He possesses a keen analytic mind and writes and speaks well. He would probably have been successful in some secular calling such as teaching, or law, and it therefore seems like a sacrifice for him to have devoted himself to Menorah work the future of which is of a problematic character. He is the son of very orthodox parents, but is himself radical both in thought and in practice. His attachment to things Jewish is nationalistic and cultural.

Louis I. Newman is of an altogether different type. His father became disgusted with Judaism even before he arrived to this country and upon his getting here kept entirely aloof from Jews and things Jewish. His son, however, was made to feel keenly his Jewish descent during his college years by his gentile classmates. This awakened the Jewishness within him which grew more intense as he came in contact with Jewish life and the synagogue, and driven by the impulse to help towards rendering the Jewish inner life more normal he has chosen the calling of rabbi. It seems that Rabbi Martin Meyer who is a Zionist and of the reformed camp influenced him greatly in that direction. All this is written up by him in an interesting article in the Menorah Journal of Dec., 1916 under the caption "Why I Chose to Be A Rabbi." He was brought to this city from San Francisco by Stephen S. Wise who has secured for him a scholarship whereby he would be able to work for his doctor's degree at Columbia and at the same time assist

my lectures on Midrash and Homiletics at the Seminary, 251
that I have formed his acquaintance. He has a striking personality,
tall and spare in build. He speaks with extraordinary charm particu-
larly when addressing a gathering. Highly intellectual and spiritual
in his outlook upon life, he seems chosen for the high calling of Jewish
leadership. Would that our Seminary had at least a few men of this
type! With the apathy of some members of our faculty, the cynicism of
others and the incompetence and lack of imagination of its present
acting president, Dr. Adler, it is no wonder that there are but few
young men of spirit in the student body of the Seminary and even these
are held down until they become tame and vapid.

The contrast between Newman and the students at the Seminary
was brought out into strong relief through an incident that occurred
in my classroom on Wednesday, January 3. A student by the name of
Solomon Goldman, who ~~is~~ in knowledge of Talmud is among the best, and
in other respects also quite superior to most of the class, was asked
by me to read the sermon which he had delivered from the Seminary pulpit
but which the class had not had a chance to hear before. While he was
reading I noticed that the students did not take what he said very
seriously. When he was through I took advantage of their want of
seriousness to point out the importance to a sermon of proper atmosphere.
As that was lacking in the classroom I could account for their semi-
frivolous attitude. As I was speaking I was interrupted by semi-jocular
remarks of one or two students in disparagement of preaching in general.
This aroused the indignation of Newman and rising from his seat he ex-
coriated the students in relation to whom he described himself as an
outsider for their cynicisms and cheap wit that they were in the habit of
launching against the ministry. This tirade of his was applauded by a
few but apparently resented by most of the men. The only answer that
the students could give came from its punster and versifier, Abraham

Burstein, who merely uttered a weak protest on the ground that a stranger had no right to meddle in the affairs of the Seminary. I, for my part did not think it prudent to agree entirely with Newman, and I pointed out that with the present conditions that made it necessary for the students to work each by himself individually, and that prevented their developing a spirit of cooperation and material helpfulness during their student years, they could not but reflect the general opinion of ministers and ministry that was prevalent everywhere, an opinion that was derogatory and discouraging. Of course I could not tell the whole truth and that was that the one really and truly responsible for the spiritual disorganization of the Seminary was its former president, the late Dr. Schechter. Though himself an interesting and even picturesque personality, he was too much interested in his own reputation as a scholar and man of letters to throw himself heart and soul into rendering the Seminary a spiritual lighthouse for American Jewry. It was he that used to wither the souls of the students with his ill-timed ~~juvenile~~ jests about rabbis and their calling and it was he that made it fashionable for all scholars and near-scholars in and about the Seminary to turn up their noses at the term "rabbi,"

* * * * *

Monday, February 5, 1917

To resume the account of my stay at Minneapolis. After breakfast I went along with Hurwitz, Newman and Sandheim to the Min. University where the convention was taking place. I found there between thirty-five and forty delegates. They devoted the morning session to the discussion of the question What should be the basis for the award of the Lehman cup? The cup has been offered for the Menorah Society that would do the best work. The discussion showed the need of formulating a standard of efficiency for the Menorah movement as a whole.

Matt invited me to take lunch at his house. Together with us went a young man of rather insignificant personality by the name of Dr. Miller, a recently graduated dentist from Denver. He teaches in ? p. 67 religious school and is an ardent admirer of his. Matt's home, like the homes of most of the Seminary graduates, bore evidence of a meagre salary. His wife seemed to be to be a very plain young woman with little of the intellectuality that one might expect in a minister's wife. They have one child, a beautiful but very wild little boy. The meal was not to my taste and I began to experience the discomfort of being away from home.

In the evening (Thursday, December 28, 1916) I delivered the address for which I had been scheduled. There were about 200 people in the audience, divided about equally between men and women. Among them were Rabbi Deinard of Minn. and Rabbis Rypkin and Herman M. Cohen of St. Paul. The last is a Seminary graduate and a former pupil of mine. I spoke for nearly an hour and a half on "What Is Judaism?" The following is an abstract: The question is implied in many statements to be found in our literature, which purport to be a sort of definition of Judaism. Cf. J. v 6 8

Yet none of these definitions is adequate for our purpose, because we put the question in a way it has never been asked before. We do not ask Whose good is to be served by keeping the Torah and the Mizvoth ours or God's?; What in our religion is more important, ceremonies or ethics?; What is primary, our relation to God or to one another?; What is the minimum to which we must adhere even on pain of death?; What distinguishes our religion from Christianity or Mohammedanism? None of these questions has relevance to our problem today when Judaism is called upon to adjust itself not only to a new cultural environment but also to a new social environment that is radically different from any type of social environment with which Judaism has ever come in

contact. The democracy of the environment which calls for a redistribution of the very units of Jewish social life is the novum in the problem. With the solvent influence exercised by the social environment upon the beliefs and practices ~~associated~~ associated with the name Judaism we begin to suspect that Judaism can function only under certain social conditions. The question What is Judaism? therefore resolves itself into the question "How do these beliefs and practices function?" For the first time we try to get at the very essence of Judaism, for the function of a thing practically constitutes its essence.

The theory of both the orthodox and the reformed school is that the beliefs and practices of Judaism are intended to make each one of us a better man or woman. If that were the case Judaism ought to be able to function despite the social redistribution of Jewry which takes place in democratic countries. The study of religion, however, helps us to understand why Judaism becomes defunct wherever Jews are ~~prevented~~ prevented from living in aggregates. It has made clear that a religion is primarily a group consciousness. Whenever through one cause or another the group consciousness is destroyed the religion which is its expression must also perish. The problem of preserving Judaism is therefore a problem of preserving the Jewish consciousness. The intrinsic value not of the beliefs and practices of Judaism is what we must recognize, but of the Jewish consciousness of which they are an expression. So viewed the following two inferences follow as to the relation of the Jewish consciousness to the beliefs and practices that go by the name of Judaism (1) The Jewish consciousness is the end whereas the beliefs and practices are only the means. The former is life the latter are truth. *p. 269* (2) The influence upon character of the belief and practices of Judaism is not exerted directly but only through the medium of the Jewish consciousness which they set into operation. Their immediate function is to integrate the individual into the Jewish consciousness.

We can now understand why the question "What is Judaism?" has taken on a new meaning. To use the analogy of electric machinery, with its dynamo, switch and current, we may say that formerly the main concern was to what use to put the current, or later on what switch to turn on, whereas now our concern is with the dynamo itself which has gotten to be out of order. (We must not, of course press the analogy for the purpose of determining which is the means and which the end.

* * * *

Tuesday, February 6, 1917

Now that we are faced with the problem of preserving the Jewish consciousness, we have to realize the following three facts about it: 1) its reality, 2) its worth, 3) the conditions requisite to its maintenance.

1) Its reality can be recognized if we take into account the reality of any crowd mind. The mob presents an instance of the ephemeral type of crowd mind. A nation or religious group possesses a crowd mind which has developed permanence and will-to-live, and to that extent is more real. (Note: Although I no longer hold that the collective mind is real in the same sense as the individual, most of what I say here still holds good of the individual mind of the Jew which harbors the memories and aspirations that found a place in the life of Israel.

October 22, 1922.) 2) Its worth may be realized if we classify the various types of crowd mind in accordance with the same principle whereby we determine the degree of development of the individual consciousness. In the case of the human mind the superior type is distinguished from the inferior by the possession of memory, imagination and personality to a more developed degree. By personality we mean a) sense of self plus b) sentiment for an ideal. If we apply the same criteria to the Jewish consciousness we become aware of its superiority to any type of crowd-mind that the human race has thus far developed. For it possesses the following:

a. A sense of unity and continuity based upon memory. This it was that enabled it to develop a national history and a national literature. The ancients had their historians and annalists. But what they wrote never passed beyond the stage of individual appreciation. The facts recorded were not made constituents of national memory. With Israel the past experiences were reverted to as a means of giving point and significance to the present. History instead of nature was the source of religious enthusiasm, so that even the nature festivals were converted into historical festivals. The very tendency to make nature subordinate to history in the evaluation of life, a tendency which is ⁱⁿ marked contrast to that displayed by the other nations of the ~~xxx~~ ancient world is unique. A striking expression of this tendency is the Bible-making power of the Jewish People. Homer for a time seemed to occupy the same place in the spiritual life of the Greeks as the Bible does in the life of the Jews. In the first place the comparison is superficial, and ~~xxxx~~ secondly, even if it did begin to receive the same kind of national recognition, that recognition never crystallized itself to sufficiently self-conscious a degree to make of Homer what the Bible came to mean to the Jews. Probably some portions of the Bible were held in the same kind of loose national appreciation during the pre-exilic era as Homer ultimately attained. By the Bible as the expression of the self-conscious soul of Israel we mean the Scriptures in their finally canonized form.

b. The power to conceive situations as yet unrealized or the power of imagination. It is that which renders its possessor capable of manipulating to his advantage forces and circumstances ^{of} which he would otherwise be a helpless victim. This power has found expression in the Messianic ideal, which did not remain the possession of a few visionaries but was adopted as an integral element in the soul of the people. It is interesting to note that the is quoted by Isaiah as a nationally accepted prophecy for the purpose of emphasizing the contrast between the actual and the ideal.

Wednesday, February 7, 1917

c. Personality. The presence of self-regarding sentiment or self-respect is evidenced by (a) the various representations of Israel as a person. (b) By the desire for the approval of the nations. (c) by the belief in the divine election of Israel. The sentiment for an ideal is represented by the part played by the God-idea. (d) Due to the peculiarly ethical cast of Israel's ideal of conduct, the conception of God ~~and~~ came to be felt as unique, and from being regarded as unique the God of Israel came to be regarded as the only God. (e) By the merciless self-criticism which is characteristic of Jewish sacred writings. (f) By disregard of the disdain and hatred of the nations.

3. Since the Jewish consciousness is a psycho-physical entity the main condition requisite to its existence is Jewish aggregate life. Since Jewish aggregate life is becoming even more difficult in the Diaspora particularly in democratic countries, Zionism is a corollary to the belief in Judaism. Though great effort is required to keep the Jewish consciousness alive, particularly since it involves the establishment of a permanent home where Jewish aggregate life would be possible, it is nevertheless worthwhile. To allow the Jewish consciousness to perish is to transgress the elementary law of human life "Thou shalt not kill;" for if we regard the mere promise of life as sacred how much more sacred is the soul of a people that has attained so high a degree of self-consciousness as did the Jewish people?

When I was through with the lecture a number of questions were put to me which convinced me that what the audience wanted was a practical program of what to do and what to believe. Hurwitz who presided called upon the rabbis to say something. Deinard refused to say anything; Rypins made some remarks which he concluded with the words "Wir bleiben beim alten." When there was a lull, Newman got up and in a few neat sentences and well turned phrases expressed his appreciation of the

the lecture. In answering the various questions I had occasion to add the following two points: 1) My object was not to present a definitely worked out program of action and belief, but only to start others thinking on the present day problem of Judaism a long lines that might lead to an adequate solution. 2) Emphasis upon Jewish consciousness as the reality with which Judaism aims at integrating us enables us to grasp the one element which is common to all kinds of Jews, believers and non-believers, to whom the continued existence of the Jewish People is still a desideratum.

When I returned to the hotel I met Hurwitz and Newman again, and the three of us went to the roof garden where we sat till about 1:30 a.m. In the course of the conversation Hurwitz expressed the opinion that while the lecture was full of content that was meaty it lacked the brilliancy of form. It was too extemporaneous in character. Newman thought otherwise. Personally I felt that I should have brought a more concrete message. As long, however, as I have not given proper literary form to the conception of Judaism which I have been advocating, the statement of the conclusions at which I have arrived in my own mind would expose me to attacks against which I would with difficulty be able to defend myself. I hope to God to be able to work out the premises in such form as to convince the most sceptical that my paramount object is to further Jewish life. If to attain that end measures of a radical ~~etc~~ character would have to be adopted, no one would then mistake those measures with those put forward by assimilationists.

During the day (Friday) I was introduced to a physician by the name of Dr. Gordon who put aside for a while his professional duties and took me to the "Tlamud Torah and social center" of which he is a director. I learned from Matt that Dr. Gordon was one of a group fo young and middle-aged men who found themselves at home neither with the orthodox nor with the reformed, and who while themselves not very observant Jews are anxious to have their children brought up Jewishly. Dr. Gordon

himself, it appeared to me, was at one time both Yeshiba babur and maskil, and as I had occasion to learn later on, was the prime mover of the undertaking to establish a modern Hebrew School. The School enjoys the reputation of being one of the very best of its kind in this country. The few classes that I visited proved to me that it deserved that reputation. In all my experience I had not seen anything on so large and well organized a scale. The only school of its kind that produced so profound an impression upon me was the Benderly School at Baltimore which I visited about seven years ago when Benderly was still the principal there. In the Minneapolis school I saw classes from the kindergarten through those in which the boys and girls were paraphrasing fluently into Hebrew some modern Hebrew poetry. I was told that the authorities paid liberal salaries to their teachers whom they expected to give up all other sources of livelihood and to concentrate upon their work in the school. They even sent to Palestine for teachers and defrayed the expense of the entire journey from the ~~Sixth~~ Orient to Minneapolis. I doubt whether any Hebrew School in the East would be capable of displaying such enterprise. What appeared strange to me however, was that Dr. Gordon seemed to view with apprehension the development of the institution into a social center and the introduction into it of social activities. In alluding to the swimming pool which is still in the process of construction he said that he was afraid that the swimming pool would drown the Talmud ~~Rank~~ Torah.

* * * *

Thursday, February 8, 1917

At night I spoke at Matt's synagogue. That was at the 8:15 service. The sundown service had been conducted in the vestry rooms. There was just a minyan present; most of them were old time "Amhaarat-zim" with long beards and ghetto manners. The "Shamos" had two of his own boys present for fear there would not be enough for a "minyan". Rabbi Matt joked with the old timers in good old Yiddish. One of the

men acted as "Baal-Tefila", and we were soon through with the first edition of the Maariv Service. The spirit in which the services were conducted, the attendance and the atmosphere that prevailed had a very depressing effect upon me. I seemed to see our people breathing its last. Nor were my spirits raised when I came to the second service. I found a most motley crowd consisting of all types of men, women and children. The synagogue which was formerly a church looked old and dismantled. The service was read this time by Matt and a so-called children's choir, or better, a little ragamuffin group screeched out some dissonances. I had to summon a great deal of courage to talk before such a tame mob.

Sabbath morning I went with Matt to the large synagogue in the more Jewish section of the city. The congregation that worships in that synagogue has an old time Rav, Rabbi Silver. About three years ago they appointed Davidowitz, a Seminary graduate as their English speaking rabbi, but he was both tactless and inactive, and they grew dissatisfied with him. The synagogue is a huge shapeless structure, with no rooms for a religious school or for social purposes. The predominant spirit is that of the little towns in Russia. My main reason for going there was that the delegates of the order "Knights of Zion" who were to hold their annual convention the week following were expected to be present there. On my way to the synagogue I was joined by Zolotkoff a former Nasi of the order, and a Mr. Schulman, its present Nasi. I had met Zolotkoff in New York where he worked a few years ago as the editor of the Yiddish Tageblatt. In his conversation with me he seemed to be displeased with New York life, probably due to his not being altogether successful here. He found fault with the patronizing and impudent aims of some of the noise makers in the Jewish community. Where would you find such an impudent fellow as Barondess? Only New York could produce such a specimen. Zolotkoff was the speaker in the synagogue on behalf of the delegates. He spoke very logically on the meaning of

of Zionism and interspersed his remarks with interesting stories and analogies. I had, however, the feeling that it was one of his oft repeated talks on the subject.

After the services the delegates were asked to go downstairs where they were served a regular Shabbos dinner with "Tcholent". The meal was concluded with a few speeches. I was not spared. When I was called upon the people clamored for Yiddish. Having been taken by surprise I fell back upon what I had said the night before, only I had to stammer it out in a broken Yiddish.

At night I was seen off to the station by Matt, by the president of his congregation and by Rabbi Kahn. I got back to New York on Monday, January 2.

On Sunday, January 14, I spoke before the Emerson Club of the University Settlement on Eldridge Street. This club is composed of former pupils of Dr. Mason, a Jewish public school principal of the lower East Side. He has kept in touch with them for a number of years; by this time some of them have made their way into the world as professional men. As the name of the club indicates, Emerson has become to them the type of the highest human development - at least so I am told by Julius Hyman a friend of Mason's. There were about twenty-five present when I spoke. One of them was a young woman, and another was a gentile who is the head worker of the institution. The chairman, Mr. Kaplan, introduced me with the remark that the last time they had a talk on Judaism was about six years ago when Dr. Mason addressed them on that subject. When I twitted them on the interest in Judaism which such a fact seemed to indicate, I noticed Mason prompt some one to explain that they had been having discussions about Judaism at various times since that "memorable" occasion when he addressed them on the subject. It is a good thing that a man like Mason is at least ashamed of not displaying more interest in Judaism.

My talk was practically the same as that given before the Menorah delegates. The questions that followed were practically of the same kind except more puerile at times, as those asked then. The head worker who had listened attentively to the entire talk put a question which he realized was not altogether relevant but which seemed to ~~aff~~ oppress him. Who is to blame, he asked, for the aloofness that exists between Jews and Gentiles? The Jews always claim that they are repelled by the Gentiles. Is it not rather true that the Jews are exclusive and do not want to have anything to do with the Gentiles? I answered his question by saying that both were equally to blame. I did not see him after I was through to gauge the effect on him of what I said there that evening.

* * *

Friday, February 9, 1917

This morning I began the second course at Teachers College. There were about twenty students present and all of them evinced great interest in the discussion of the subject "What in the New Testament is new?" My object was to point out that most of the spiritual elements for which the New Testament is praised have their counterpart in rabbinic Judaism. The only new elements were introduced by Paul and his followers, namely the deification of Jesus and antinomianism. But while these elements are new they do not represent the spiritual insight of the Jewish people or even of that part of the Jewish people which was known as Jude^s-Christian. They represent rather the reaction of the heathen mind upon the spiritual experience of the Jewish people. In contrast with this we have in the post-biblical literature that is Jewish, the reaction of the Jews themselves upon their own original experience as recorded in the Bible.

* * *

